THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXVII OCTOBER, 1938 No. 220

EDITORIAL

It is hard indeed for any Christian writer to put pen to paper without making mention of political affairs. Yet it is futile in a monthly periodical to comment on a situation which will have receded into the distant-seeming past (so quickly do things move) before the words appear in print. The only counsel which is always true is that which will encourage "charity towards all, malice towards none."

The International Seminar at Geneva alluded to last month was deeply interesting. The topics of the Anglican lecturer were: (1) Church and Bible; (2) the Church of England, Catholic; (3) the Church of England, Reformed; (4) Church and State in England; (5) the Church of England and Reunion. There were among the lecturers and students a few Orthodox and Old Catholics and a good number of Lutherans, but the majority seemed to have a Barthian theology. The Anglican was questioned for two hours after his final talk. At first the questions were all about the Apostolical Succession. He presently suggested that this topic, for all its importance, was not the sole Anglican affirmation, and that something rather more theological would be welcome. This opened the floodgates. What was all this talk about co-operation between man and God? How can you attach such value to Sacraments? What of the divine freedom, the absolute decrees? Are you not by your "humanism" unduly limiting God? The Anglican, feeling rather like Alice ("I wish the creatures would not argue so much"), replied faintly that St. Paul did not seem to him at every point to be a thorough-going, consistent Calvinist, and that the Gospels, while innocent of Pelagianism, nevertheless exhibited a certain measure of belief in man. He did not seem to be making much headway, but Dr. Adolf Keller, the accom-

plished President of the Seminar, assured him afterwards that a dent or two, a scratch here and there, had been made in the Barthian panoply.

It is not surprising that the panoply should be so complete. Our weakness is undoubtedly in the direction of theological Pelagianism and political and ecclesiastical compromise, and the situation on the Continent is so different from ours that Continental faith, where it exists, is likely to be in the imperative mood. It was in fact noticeable in the books produced in connection with Oxford and Edinburgh that the "activism" came from America, the religious totalitarianism came from the continent of Europe, and that the British writers exercised a familiar talent for comprehensiveness. This is not of course to say that all American theologians are activists (the interesting pages of the *American Church Monthly* contain many reminders of the necessity of theology), or that all continentals are Barthian. And there is a stronger tendency in recent English theological writing, a revival of the Maurician insistence on God as the one Reality. This lesson is partly a native recovery of truth in itself and for itself, but we have profited by the hard experience of our fellow-Christians on the Continent.

Our own comparatively easy situation has its essential dangers. There is on the one hand the temptation to Westernize, to assimilate ourselves and finally to unite ourselves, unconditionally or almost unconditionally, to the Church which seems to be strong, consistent, confident. The consistency will not bear very close examination. Necessities are very different today in Italy or Spain, in Germany or what was Austria, in France, in England, in Ireland. And this can hardly fail to impair confidence. Yet strength remains. An Anglican worshipper in Chartres Cathedral on the Feast of the Nativity of our Lady was profoundly impressed by the devotion of the thousands of people who had assembled to assist at Benediction, with Sermon and Procession. The zeal of the congregation seemed not unworthy of the exquisite beauty of stone and glass which has made Chartres one of the seven wonders of the Church. Shall we end our anxieties and uncertainties by going as far as possible in that direction? For all our admiration we cannot do that, because we are governed by what follows from our apprehension of the truth.

And yet it is clear enough that Christianity is the one alternative to the secular paganism which in varying dress is

making a strong claim for the allegiance of mankind. There is a tendency in England just now, among persons who are serious and well-meaning but without much understanding of the meaning of true religion, to equate Christianity and democracy, to assume that we are a Christian country, and that our policy is the Christian policy. It is always intensely dangerous for faith when politicians begin to think of Christianity as "useful." The leaders of the Church, welcoming this willingness to co-operate and desiring also to keep the Christian forces together, are at once tempted to let down the standard, to accept fourscore or even fifty for a hundred measures. Nevertheless, this is the precise danger which has to be faced. The Church *is* in the world, and the Church of England *is* set amid the English world of education, politics, business, industry and sport. That *is* the world which has to be redeemed. It is not enough to say, "We are the Church, and we must be the Church." What we are is the Church in the world, and the world is the arena of our Church life. That is why it is so inadequate and so ineffective to define "Anglicanism" in the way in which it was defined in the pamphlet to which we alluded to last month. Anglicanism does indeed stand for faithfulness to the Creed, but it exercises that faithfulness in the environment of the life of England. And it is in this context that we conclude our observations on the pamphlet with some consideration of the liturgical proposals of the writer.

There is a quality about them for which the most polite word is perhaps academic. According to the writer, there is in the Church of England no real liturgical difficulty at all. There is only a "tumult" manufactured by some of the younger bishops, "who have chosen to disturb their dioceses." The three remedies which are said to be being proposed for the unnecessary disease "are all equally inadmissible." Worst of all is the Book of 1928, which is "woolly," "pathetic," "a document not of worship but of police" (*sic*), unsanctioned by Parliament, a document which "educated men could not easily use," which "a sincere man would not wish to use," which "no honourable right-thinking man can use." From all this it follows that those of us who use it or would like to use it are insincere, dishonourable and wrong-thinking. All that can be said for them is that they do the best they can to counteract the effects of such education as they have had.

This is so plainly extravagant that it needs no comment. The second remedy is the Book of 1549. This, it is said, "never

had canonical sanction or ecclesiastical authority of any kind." Dr. Frere (Proctor and Frere, pp. 50-52) puts it in a different way. But our author is sure, and is further of the opinion that any sanction given to 1549 would be episcopal "totalitarianism." We had always thought that 1549 was a monument of Anglican Catholicism, although its Canon is admittedly rather long, and we are sure that the late Lord Halifax, assisting constantly at the rite of 1549 in Hickleton Church during a period of twenty-five years (see *Life*, ii., p. 349), had no idea of the dangerous concessions that he was making to dictatorship. He even referred with satisfaction to the fact that the use of it had been sanctioned by one bishop—namely, his own *proprius episcopus* of York.

The third remedy is "at first sight more attractive," a schedule of permitted variations from 1662. But on second thoughts our author perceives that it would never do. It would recognize a right deemed to reside with "the bishops" and, in a later sentence, "solely in the bishop's bosom." All sorts of things might happen, "including permission officially granted to omit or bowdlerize the Nicene Creed." The statements which we quoted hitherto needed no more than to be quoted. They answered themselves. But this one needs to be exposed. The Archbishops' Commission on Church and State, and the Report thereon of a Joint Committee of Canterbury Convocation, both assumed as a matter of course that the authority would be that of the Convocations, with the assent of the laity. Nothing else has ever been suggested. The episcopate, in the words of the Convocation Committee, is "the appointed instrument which focuses the authority inherently and ultimately belonging to the whole Church as such, and diffused in varying degrees, through all estates and orders within the Church." Further, it is known that conferences are being held at Lambeth upon the matter, and, although their deliberations are at present unpublished, it is known that the personnel of the conference includes bishops, priests and laymen, and that all sections of the Church are represented. Yet our author speaks of being required to accept "a right in the bishops" (later, "the bishop") "privately to revise the Prayer Book without the voice of the Church being heard at all, and to impose the result upon the Church without any canonical process whatsoever."

The three remedies having all been rejected, there remains 1662. But here it is said that, inasmuch as liturgy must reflect theology, and as theology is moving (though only, it

seems, in one direction), liturgy must remain "fluid, more or less." Thus 1662 really means 1662 *plus*. *Plus* what? *Plus* anything that can scrape kinship with Catholicism. But would not this be anarchy? our author asks, and reassures himself by suggesting that hymnody is a true and sufficient parallel. An official hymn-book would have condemned us for ever to bad hymns. We are to choose prayers, as hymns are chosen, from private and unofficial collections. In this way anarchy is to be avoided and liturgical progress made. Such slight confusion as there is at present, fomented by the younger bishops, would quickly disappear. We cannot persuade ourselves that this represents the way in which Catholic Churchmen should behave, or that it would lead to peace. Some of our enthusiasts within the Church of England have some lessons of wisdom and obedience to learn. For the burning conviction of this writer we again declare our unstinted admiration. But some of his convictions seem to us to be such as neither can nor should be entertained.

By way of postscript to the above we refer to the letter of a correspondent asking for some sympathy with him in his plight. He is the incumbent of a very poor parish, and could not afford to buy a whole set of 1928 Prayer Books. Nor can his people buy books for themselves. He points out that in addition to other advantages the method of saying the Prayer of Oblation and the Lord's Prayer immediately after the present Prayer of Consecration has this merit—a slight manuscript correction to existing books will make the change perfectly easy to follow. Will not THEOLOGY lend its approval to this method? The answer is not difficult. We are of opinion that it would be a very desirable and simple change. The only thing that cannot at present be said for it is that it has any authority. But it might have before long.

THE ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTIONS OF THE CHURCH

THERE are two alternative conceptions about the Church's nature. One is that the Church is a product of human exertions, the other that it is a supernatural and divine creation.

I

Those who regard the Church as simply human begin with the individual, and view him already under the influence of religion. He is a believer in Christ. He then associates himself with other like-minded people for the purpose of such edification and support as he may require. And in this way there comes into existence a Church.

One of the ablest exponents of this conception of the Church's nature was a learned German historical critic, Troeltsch, Professor at Heidelberg, and afterwards at Berlin. He devoted to the subject not less than twenty years, read enormously and thought deeply, and published at intervals the accumulating results of his reflections.

1. His first reflections were on the *nature of religion and the Church.* Religion, he said, creates a Church. But the two are essentially different, and indeed actually opposed. For religion is personal: the Church is social. Religion is inward: the Church is outward. Religion is fluid, enthusiastic, incalculable, mysterious. There is nothing mysterious about a Church. In fact the most living periods of religion are those which are most independent of a Church. A Church is an association which religion has produced. It is an organization. No doubt organization has its uses, in fact a higher importance than some modern minds are willing to allow. But in any case organization is inferior to life: the one being essential, the other optional. Troeltsch asserts that Jesus did not found a Church, but only planted a seed in religious hearts, and the seed brought forth its fruit. Of course there were communities which lived this faith. But there was no Church in the sense of an organized centralized religious fellowship. There was a powerful religious influence at work, but there was no supernatural institution. No doubt in course of time religion and Church became in the popular opinion identified. Nevertheless, says the writer, they are opposites, just as the individual and

the social are. He is convinced that religion, and therefore Christian religion, is independent of any particular organization. That is the conclusion of his first reflections.

2. After an interval of years he issued a second series of reflections: *A retrospect over half a century.* He said that to a considerable extent religion was becoming increasingly separated from theology. That is a conspicuous characteristic of modern life. A new idea of the Church has now arisen. It is not a community based on doctrine, but on practical religion. The bond of union is agreement in general outlook on life combined with freedom about dogma. The modern tendency is a Church without a Creed. This Creedless, undogmatic condition has been long preparing.

German Protestantism had grown accustomed to represent religion as produced by the feeling of absolute dependence on an unseen power. There followed a loose employment of biblical phraseology lacking in dogmatic precision. Theology became indefinite and vague. Bible study concentrated on the practical in the preaching of Jesus, the rest of the Bible being more or less ignored. A positive dislike of dogma began to prevail. The Church as an article of the Creed sank into obscurity. Instead of writing about the history of the Church, men wrote about the history of the Christian religion, and the various forms which that religion had assumed.

3. A third time this writer published his reflections. This time on *the increasing individualism in the Church.* It filled him with misgivings. He called it a deplorable unchurchliness. What did this modern development really mean? Why this indifference to corporate religion? It was not caused by opposition to religion itself. But the impression which prevails in the public mind is that religion does not consist in anything that association can impart. Religion was viewed as a private and personal affair; something which each separate individual assimilates so far as he can. Churches and ministers do violence to the true nature of religion: or else they are superfluous. In the critic's opinion this is the view held by the younger students of theology, in fact by the intellectual classes. It is prevalent in university life. In the modern world individualism is hostile to any Church. Intellectuals consider that if the masses require a Church that is only a sign of their backwardness. Public worship is an indication of the spiritual weakness of mankind. The reason why the Church is not appreciated is because religion is regarded in a purely individualistic way. Religion, being essentially personal and inward, is considered independent of the external and the corporate.

But the critic feels how unsatisfactory all this is. Born individualist though he was, he felt that this modern indifference to corporate religion has lost the sense of proportion. He pleads that individualism has its limits. The individual must make concessions to the religious community. Otherwise that community cannot continue to exist.

So the problem is—How can the individual be induced to make to the Church concessions sufficient to secure its existence and its integrity ? His answer is that of course no Lutheran can regard the Church as a depository of doctrine and regulations for worship. But he can at least regard it as something resulting from the fact of Christ. That view of the Church would impose restrictions on the exaggerations of individualism. Here, however, the critic feels constrained to offer an apology. He is very sensitive that German Protestants will consider his suggestion an abandonment of the individualist principle. He admits the difficulty. All he can answer is that it is easy to raise objections, and not easy to define the limit to individualism. Yet it is absolutely essential that somehow a limit should be found, unless the social side of religion is entirely to disappear.

Consider, says Troeltsch, the case of a preacher. He ought to be perfectly free to utter his inmost mind. Well, extend the preacher's independence to the furthest limits consistent with the existence of the Church. A preacher cannot make the Church dependent on his private and individual opinions. Men who claim unrestricted freedom to say whatever they may think are not adapted to be preachers in a community which has principles of its own. He who will serve a historic society must be prepared to make the best of actual conditions. If a man rejects the Bible, and regards the Reformation as a world calamity, he should find some other place than the pulpit of a Protestant denomination wherein to proclaim his views. He who can no longer pray the Lord's Prayer may be a very worthy person, but he is not suited to be preacher to a Lutheran congregation. The preacher has not only himself to consider, but alsc the community. And although the Church is not in this Lutheran critic's opinion the divinely created sphere of redemption, it is at any rate a great historical association.

At this point the critic becomes autobiographical. He relates that in his own early ministry there were requirements which he found difficult to accept. Either he must give up the preacher's office, or else repeat a Liturgy. Which side of the alternative he accepted he does not relate. Robert Elsmere would have encouraged the one: Richard Meynell the other. But Troeltsch confesses that there are possibilities here which are neither morally nor religiously right.

This individualist conception of religion naturally led Troeltsch to consider the nature of Truth. Individuals were unable to agree. Doctrine was no longer regarded as truth supernaturally revealed. It was not God illuminating man, but man inquiring about God. Truth was therefore the product of individual reflection—the human mind constructing religious ideas. Those ideas must inevitably vary with individual temperament and capacity. That every individual should think alike in religion was not to be expected. Truth ceased to be regarded as objective reality. It was reduced to the level of subjective opinion.

4. These three series of reflections on religion and the Church are the product of a singularly acute and thoughtful mind labouring to neutralize the disabling results of the theory which he feels constrained to defend. If the Church is nothing more than a product of human exertions; if religion is simply inward and individual, so that the corporate and institutional has a very inferior claim on loyalty; if sharp contrasts are drawn between life as essential and organization as optional, and the Church has no authority to maintain its corporate convictions, and impress them on its members—then this Lutheran critic has certainly done his best with the theories which he accepted. But it can be no surprise that his efforts to secure the loyal allegiance of independent individualists to a Church whose claims are only human, and whose authority is so restricted, were not from a practical point of view attended with much success.

II

The alternative conception of the Church begins with the social. It regards the Church as a corporate institution owing its origin to the action of Jesus Christ in training the Twelve and uniting them to Himself within one Body. This is the community which at His Ascension He bequeathed to the world: the community into which at the first Whitsuntide the Spirit entered and took permanent possession. It is entrusted with the Faith: authorized exponent of the Christian Revelation, commissioned to guide the individual and instruct the ignorant. It is the living embodiment of the religion of the Incarnation, perpetual witness to redemption by its Creed and its devotion. It is the medium through which the invisible Christ communicates with men. It is the social Body through which union with Christ is attained. Within it the Redeemer's blessings and gifts are imparted. It is endowed with supernatural powers which none but God can give—power to bless, to consecrate, to strengthen with the Holy Spirit. Its absolutions uttered on

earth are sealed in Heaven. In its superhuman dignity and spiritual distinction it stands alone. It is nothing less than a Divine creation.

It is most instructive to find that this gifted Lutheran critic is keenly conscious of the unifying power and constraining influence that this conception of the Church as supernatural and divine must exert on every individual who intelligently accepts it. Troeltsch is well aware that this conception has an immensely superior degree of religious effectiveness. In a remarkable passage he declares that: " When once the supreme miracle of the Incarnation of God in Jesus and in the Bible is present, the continuation of this miracle in the hierarchy and the Sacraments is a logical sequence; nothing short of the complete deification of the Church as an institution can really prevent the humanization of its doctrines and its truths. Hence even among the Protestant Churches, Calvinism, which retains a remnant of the *jus divinum* in its Church organization, has down to the present day, in England and America, offered a stronger resistance to the disintegrating influence of modern science than have the idealistic Church arrangements of Luther."

His acutely penetrating mind clearly sees its value. But he feels compelled by his presuppositions to reject it. Why ? Because history must be confined within the limits of the merely human. History is concerned with that which is possible for men. The sphere of the historian is restricted to the natural. He has no concern with supernatural occurrences or Divine interventions. These are outside his sphere. And certainly if every event must be explicable within the purely natural and the human, a narrative which begins with a Virgin Birth and terminates with an Ascension into Heaven is inevitably discredited. If the person of Christ must be accounted for strictly within the natural, then the Incarnation is of necessity absolutely ruled out. And that is the conclusion that this historical critic reaches. It is not only the supernatural character of the Church that he rejects. He has already decided against the supernatural character and personality of Christ. Nevertheless the value of his reflections is great. His clear, consistent mind sees plainly enough that if the Incarnation is true the supernatural character of the Church cannot reasonably be repudiated.

A criticism which a Scottish theologian has made on this Lutheran exponent of Christian religion is that those who adopt his presuppositions " get out of history, in the way of revelation, just so much as they have resolved beforehand that it can be permitted to contain. The possibilities have been fixed in advance; the facts are compelled to fit the method by which

they are to be treated."* They rule that wholly unique events, or miracles, do not happen. You must never discover in the past anything that is supernatural, because it is already determined that no special revelation is possible.

Now while for practical purposes we all acknowledge that the limitation of history to the natural is not only legitimate but also of great use, we are at the same time bound to remember that the realities of religion can never be finally decided by ruling out the supernatural and confining attention to the restricted sphere of the natural, which is the self-appointed department of the historical critic. Religion is an appeal to the entire man, in the full possession and exercise of all his spiritual capacities. We acknowledge that neither a supernatural Church nor a supernatural Christ can be convincing so long as we restrict ourselves to history within purely human limits. Both the Divinity of our Lord and the Divine Creation of His Church are a challenge to faith. And both alike, if they are to win acceptance, must be accepted by the highest capacities of human nature enlightened by the influence of its Creator.

The mission of the Church, its authority, and its claim on the consciences of men, must depend on which of these two alternative and contradictory conceptions of its nature is accepted as the true. It is impossible that its mission to the world can be the same if it is regarded as a natural product of human energy, as it must be if it is regarded as an institution Divinely created and endowed with supernatural powers.

W. J. Sparrow Simpson.

THE CLERICAL CAREER OF J. R. GREEN

When John Richard Green died at Mentone on March 7, 1883, lifelong friends and admirers of his work were lavish in their praise—Stubbs, Freeman, Creighton, Gardiner; Bryce did not hesitate to class him with Gibbon and Macaulay. These five knew something of the study and writing of history. When on June 7, 1909, the University of Oxford gathered to honour Green's memory, the Vice-Chancellor (Sir Herbert Warren) and Sir Charles Firth testified that their first reading of the *Short History* " marked an epoch in their lives " and " seemed like a new revelation to a generation heretofore fed on the arid paragraphs of the Student's Hume." In *The Times* of December 10 last appeared an article commemorating the

* H. R. Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology*, p. 203.

centenary of Green's birth, in which Sir John Marriott adds his testimony that that *History* was to his generation "nothing less than a revelation." "My own copy of the first edition, acquired as a schoolboy, is before me as I write, and is still greatly treasured as the book which first gave me some conception of what the history of England really means." And there are other witnesses as authoritative and emphatic. Thus Dr. G. P. Gooch finds himself able to remark roundly: "The publication of the *Short History* in 1874 forms an epoch in historiography. The English-speaking world received the first coherent and intelligible account of its own past. . . . That this reading of history is now a commonplace is mainly the work of Green. . . . The history of England was no longer an old almanack, but the development of a living organism, the English people." Like Sir John, Dr. Gooch notes the brilliance of Green's lighter essays, some of which were reprinted in the two volumes of *Stray Studies* (Macmillan, 1876 and 1903), and suggests that they give Green a claim to be regarded as "the creator of the historical *causerie* in England, light and graceful in form but careful in workmanship and suggestive in thought."* Thus the experts. If to their testimony we add the suffrages of the numberless and nameless "intelligent persons"—artisans, teachers, clerks, clergy and ministers of all denominations, English, colonial and American readers of all trades and professions—whose purchases ensured the instantaneous success and the permanent vitality of the book, there can be no doubt that the verdict of Green's "dear master," Bishop Stubbs, may stand: J. R. Green was a writer of real historical genius.

I

But Green was not only an historian; he was for nearly a decade a devoted parish priest in the East End of London—from Advent, 1860, when he was ordained by Tait, then Bishop of London, to Easter, 1869, when impaired health and other causes prompted the resignment of his benefice. This phase of his career, besides contributing elements of the first moment to his equipment as the historian of the English people, provides something of a footnote to the history of the English Church in that difficult and critical period of social reconstruction. His title was to St. Barnabas, King's Square, off Goswell Road, E.C., his vicar was the Rev. Henry Ward, a man of liberal and evangelical outlook, whose son, Mr. T. Humphry Ward, the husband of the authoress of *Robert Elsmere*, became Green's admiring pupil and remained his devoted friend to the end.

* G. P. Gooch, *History and Historians* (1913), pp. 354, 355.

Other plans for a profession had been discussed and discarded; there was even a hitch over Green's somewhat unreasonable refusal to "get up" Paley's *Evidences* for his ordination examination. But, the decision once made, Green gave himself in complete dedication to the duties and demands of his calling. Other distinguished English authors have cultivated history or letters while performing the duties and receiving the modest stipend of a parochial clergyman, but in Green's case the uniqueness lies in the degree of ardour and entire devotion with which he pursued the work lying to his hand. Self-forgetful enthusiasm is as clear a mark of his career as a pastor of souls as it was to be in the last ten years of his life as an historian; that is one fact which gives a rare splendour to his short life. It ought not to be forgotten how one English historian fulfilled his apprenticeship, not only, like many a country parson, in solitude of spirit and remote from the refreshment of congenial companionship, but also amid the economic and social confusions, the noise and the smells, of the East London of seventy years ago.

Two quotations from Green's letters may suggest the transition from the enthusiasm of his first curacy to the cloudier days when the grind had begun to tell upon body and spirit. While his general health was reasonably satisfactory, and while with Mr. Ward, in whose family he found an affectionate welcome, Green's days were both busy and happy. He writes cheerfully to "an idle, bucolic country parson" suggesting that he should set about some serious and steady literary work:

> "In the country there is no excuse for remissness *in re literaria*. It is the only charm against the devil. Excuse there might be for me—breakfasting at 8 and snatching half-an-hour of Stanley's book over my bread and butter—then hurrying from morning prayer at St. Matthew's to open the school and confer with my vicar; letter and lecture-writing, visiting and the etceteras of the day till 12; then, after luncheon, a walk to the British Museum and grind there till 4.30, dinner and a trot home; tea at the parsonage; a chat with Mrs. W., a romp with the children till the parish again claims me from 7-9 for lectures, Bible Classes, music do., confirmation do., committee meetings and the like. A good two hours' reading or sermon-writing sends me to bed at 12."*

But this earlier and happier phase soon passed; the clouds of ill-health, mental depression, intellectual isolation, overwork, rolled up and the skies grew grey and lowering. The "morbus," the "black bile," that afflict the tribe of students and men of letters soon found another victim. Historical research itself

* Leslie Stephen, *Letters* of J. R. Green, p. 75.

became only an anodyne to dull the depression of mind and spirit.

> " I came today (he wrote in 1877) among my old papers, on a dirty notebook with all my notes of the reading I did for a Life of Patrick fifteen years ago. It brought back such a flood of memories. I had come to London full of hopes and ideals only to see them foiled and myself utterly alone without a friend in all this Babylon, and then came darkness and misery till I roused myself and fled to the British Museum and steadied myself by working morning after morning in its library. . . It was a strange life, half with Patrick and the great library, half in the wretched purlieus of Clerkenwell and St. Luke's."

When in the autumn of 1865 he was promoted to the vicarage of St. Philip's, Stepney, there must have been fewer mornings to spare for the Museum. Instead, there was the multifarious detail of the parochial machinery of a slum parish —visiting, committees, accounts, squabbles, outings, clubs. . . . There are some lively words of conscious autobiography in one of his reprinted reviews upon the worries of the East End vicar's Monday morning, when " all the complicated machinery of a great ecclesiastical, charitable and educational organization has got to be wound up afresh and set going for another week." " Managing this parish is like walking on a wall adorned with broken bottles. . . . Convincing churchwardens of their real insignificance while remaining on the best possible terms with them is a process which varies the monotony of one's life with stray gleams of fun." There follow illustrations limned with characteristic vividness of sundry awkward types, including the unco' guid guarding with careful reserve their own small modicum of private virtue. The monotony must have been more evident than the fun, but many of his experiences in these years at Stepney were neither humorous nor monotonous. There was an occasion when he took tea and had talk from 11 p.m. to 2.30 a.m. with some 150 young women of the type whose company could not have been acceptable to the more respectable members of his flock. He learns a good deal of the ethics and the finance of the sin of great cities, he discovers the inadequacy of the moral restraints effected in Sunday School and Church, and makes the charitable comment: " There were few cases of violent disgust or great remorse. That the step upward seemed so little to them showed that the step downwards had not been great. We must not transfer the gulf which in our lives parts virtue from vice to the lives of the London poor." So, too, his exploits in the great cholera epidemic of 1866: the young vicar, regardless of the strain and the danger of infection, spent his strength day and night in the hospital wards, the infested

tenements, the burial grounds. There is a touch of the melodramatic when we learn that " his best helpers were the lowest women of the town "; there is something of the comic in the story of his trying to carry a big burly patient down the stairs on the way to hospital and both tumbling down to the bottom together.

Green's meditations upon " the social question " formed the subject of a good many articles contributed to the *Saturday Review*, some of which are reprinted in the *Stray Studies*. There, among lighter pieces on " Donkey Racing," " Semi-detached Wives," " The Florence of Dante," and his own two favourite short studies, " Buttercups " and " Children by the Sea," are to be found deliverances on the problems of destitution, pauperism, Poor Relief, sanitation; and on those large social and economic issues Green's writing exhibits both the warmth of his sympathy with the victims of social maladjustments and his cool, realistic appraisement of the worth or worthlessness of suggested remedies. He sees well enough that the pathway to better things will be long and tedious; he has small patience with the easy solutions proffered by well-meaning amateurs from the West End. He is the stern foe of casual charity and sees his own clerical colleagues as the intermediary agents of this evil in its most demoralizing form: " One clergyman boasts of having posted two hundred begging letters in a day." . . . " The greater number of the East End clergy have converted themselves into relieving officers. Sums of enormous magnitude are annually collected and dispensed by them either personally or through district visitors, nine-tenths of whom are women, and the bulk silly and ignorant women." The results are waste, overlapping, ineffectiveness and, in the recipients of the doles, an increase of imposition, mendicancy and pauperism. The only effective cure is, he insists, that a national and municipal system of Poor Relief must be given a fair trial, and any defects remedied by Parliament. The religious and other voluntary agencies may co-operate, may bring their own special contributions of human sympathy and intimate knowledge, but by themselves they only intensify the evil they seek to remedy. Thus this group of Green's earlier essays shew him as a social reformer pioneering the way of Barnett and Toynbee Hall, of Octavia Hill and the Charity Organization Society, as one possessed of a cool, clear head no less than of a warm heart. Perhaps, too, they help to explain how it was that when, within a few months, their author, released from his unequal struggle with the poverty of an East End parish, turned to less urgent and more spacious themes, he wrote of " things far off and battles long ago " as one who remembered that history is the

record of conflicts, tensions, triumphs, sustained and won by men and women not fundamentally dissimilar from the men and women of his own real world. Green's parochial, like Gibbon's military, experience was not without value to the historian.

II

These varied and educative human contacts and the routine drudgery of the parochial machinery came to an end with the resignation of his benefice at Easter, 1869. Looking back, it is clear that Green ought never to have undertaken the oversight of such a parish as St. Philip's, with its 16,000 people, its mission church and numerous organizations, its staff of four curates, its financial burdens and modest stipend. Bravely had he borne the burden and heat of the day, and here, as in other connections, one is tempted to remark that not all the capable and devoted parish priests of the Church of England in that time of turmoil and transition belonged to the Anglo-Catholic school. The clerical career of John Richard Green provides one example of the fact that in the slums of great cities the "ritualistic" clergy held no monopoly of self-denial and social passion. If Green had never written one book of history he would in all probability never have been known to history—but he ought to have been known. For of his pastoral as of his historical career it is true, he, being made perfect in a short time, fulfilled a long time. Short as his time was, it proved he had in him the true pastoral gifts: he was at home with all sorts and conditions of men—in their classes and clubs, in homes and hospitals, by his own fireside or on their annual outings; his heart was as full of tolerance and pity as his head was clear to resist unregulated and unwise remedies; he won the trust and affection of watchmakers, lodging-house keepers, dock labourers, coiners, costermongers, and the love of little children. If saintliness means a life filled day and night with active benevolence, unwearied patience, self-discipline, courage, meekness, the spending of time and money and mental energy on the poor, the halt, the maimed, the sick, while expecting no reward nor even the approbation of those he lived to serve; if it means preserving all through some touch of gaiety, some talent for whimsicality, some defiance of the obvious, then J. R. Green was one of the Church of England's unadvertised saints.

One fault he had: he was careless of his own health, he was ignorant of the virtue of moderation in work. That failing in part accounts for his resignation. Overwork, continued lassitude, medical advice, the desire for uninterrupted historical

study—these are sufficient and honourable reasons for the closing of that chapter of his activity. Other and deeper and more interior motives there doubtless were, but they do not lie on the surface, they were not deployed in the public eye, the evidence as to their weight in his own private estimates is lacking, or at least conflicting. Hints of temptation to "unconscious equivocation" are beside the point.* Green at thirty was no finished philosophical theologian, but he, like other broad Churchmen, knew enough of the progressive development of theological thought down many centuries to enable him to know that intellectual freedom itself would in the long run suffer if the historic Creeds and Anglican Articles were relegated to the domain of "obsolete dogmas." Formularies—the Creeds and, to a far less extent, the Articles—are, as he wrote, aids to faith in a Living Being and witnesses to the continuity of Christian tradition. There will, it is true, always be "a break and dissonance" between their literal accuracy and the forward-reaching consciousness of the Christian Society. But we cannot always be altering formularies to keep pace with the changing connotation of the English language—a bridegroom may still properly promise to "worship" his wife, and intelligent men "take things in the rough." Theology is not the only science where we see and know and prophesy in part.† *Essays and Reviews* had, after all, been published nine years before, and its authors had not yet been excommunicated with bell, book and candle: the pair of essayists brought up for judgment had been delivered by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and a third was on his way to the sees of Exeter, London and Canterbury. These were omens of a freshening wind that Green did not fail to note.‡ One who could pen as he did in 1864 the comment on these ecclesiastico-judicial proceedings: "The history of the Church is the record of its education by the Spirit of God," stands within the true tradition of Anglicanism, Broad or High or Low, and need have no fear of falling through "unconscious equivocation" into intellectual dishonesty and the acted untruth. Green's liberal and mystical version of essential Christianity is indistinguishable from that occupied by the Cambridge Platonists of the seventeenth, or by the Liberal (Catholic or Evangelical) of the twentieth, century. Since the days of what Stubbs was pleased to call his *peccadillo di Colenso*, Anglican theology has made great strides forward—that is to say, backward—towards the breadth, depth and freedom of the great Alexandrian mystics and

* Leslie Stephen, *Letters*, p. 71.

† *Letters*, p. 164 (1866); *cf.* pp. 140 (1864), 119 (1863).

‡ "Four-fifths of the actual contents of the book has since been digested into the system of the Church" (S. C. Carpenter, *Church and People*, 1789-1889, p. 508).

Platonists of the third and fourth centuries. Perhaps only the habitual acidity of his references to Nonconformity distinguishes the Vicar of St. Philip's from many a latter-day liberal Anglican. He was theologian enough to know that the great doctrinal systematizers of the mediæval Church, Aquinas himself, for instance, were all at heart mystics feeding their souls in pastures that lie beyond the pale light of reason; *pectus facit theologum*. They would have said, as he said in writing of Christianity as " the religion of the Future," " If there be any truth in our veriest instincts God must ever be beyond us, beyond our power, our knowledge, our virtue." So might have written any of the friends of Church or Westcott or Gore; within the next decade *Lux Mundi* was to make its contribution to that unending task: disencumbering, reinterpreting, explaining the faith of a Christian in terms and categories adjusted to the intellectual and moral atmosphere of the passing generations. But Green did not live to see and read *Lux Mundi*; his early manhood was past before the new theologians had worked out their rejoinder to the challenge of the new evolutionary science and of biblical criticism. No one man can fight the intellectual war on all fronts, and Green had turned from theology to history before the close of the first and most uncomfortable years of a " yeasty " period. Like many a gifted contemporary, he felt the pressure of the destructive elements in the new intellectual outlook; hence from 1864 there are signs of a growing desire to find time to think, to rest from too much talking, to lay down the responsibilities of a parochial ministry.

There are two things to be said about Green's relinquishment of his clerical status. The one is that he resigned his cure of souls both because of the state of his health and because, under the pressure of the intellectual conflicts of this time, he became convinced of his growing inability to act as a middleman between the theologians and the man in the pew. He finds, for instance, the preparation and delivery of sermons increasingly irksome and difficult; it is needless to remark that that was a duty his very sincerity and fundamental veracity would make more difficult. He finds his own mind moving further away from the mind of " Jack, Tom and Harry," and grows conscious of a lack of " popular fibre " which puts him out of sympathy with men in the mass. They, like Mr. Gradgrind, clamour for facts, for ever more and more hard facts, while his own mind goes sounding on its dim and perilous way towards those remoter regions where the concrete facts of history are chiefly symbols of a timeless relation between God and man. The personal religion of the historian was becoming less and less dependent upon the facts of history, less and less concerned with the Logos

made flesh, more and more with the Logos who was in the beginning, the Light of every man coming into the world, and with the Spirit which is to lead the passing generations into all truth. This is Green's "Everlasting Yea" which he had learned from F. D. Maurice and which we have no right to say he ever denied in thought, word or deed. It is not "unorthodox"; it is, on the contrary, scriptural, primitive, patristic, mediæval, modern, but it may easily, and in Green's mind it did, evoke a mood in which arises the desire for relief from the duties of a cure of souls. Five years before he had confessed the weight of this feeling to Professor Boyd Dawkins:

> "As you know, to be what men call a 'preacher' is not one of my ambitions; but to be a clergyman at all requires that one should speak to the people, and I feel that unless in some way this 'speaking' of mine becomes more real than it has been, becomes intelligible to those whom I address, it will be impossible for me to speak at all, to remain a clergyman at all."*

So far his own personal position; on the other hand it is clear that Green was at this period firmly convinced of the value of the national Church, if only as an educative and refining agency of the new democracy. His historical knowledge as to the place of the Church in the origin and growth of our institutions and civil polity was reinforced by his experience of actual conditions in his London parishes. That sense of the social value of the Establishment is a note he strikes more than once in his articles and book reviews, while in a letter to Edward Denison, penned on the eve of his resignation from St. Philip's, he writes in so many words of his own personal disinclination "to part cable altogether—the hold the Church has over me, however slight, is a really healthy hold to a mind like mine." He hints at the probability that a post of a non-parochial kind is on its way. In point of fact various proposals had been made: the Vice-Principalship of the Training College at Culham, an Under-Inspectorship of Schools in the London Diocese, and now an appointment at King's College, London. But when Stubbs was leaving Navestock for Oxford and reluctantly contemplating the resignation of the Lambeth Librarianship, he had thought of Green as his successor, and early in 1869, when the misdeeds of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners had been set right and reasonable financial provision secured for the preservation of the books and manuscripts, Archbishop Tait offered the post to Green.† Stubbs hastened to send his congratulations—and his

* *Letters*, p. 141 (1864).

† *Stray Studies*, II., 1876, contains Green's article on The Lambeth Library: a spirited attack on the parsimony of the Commissioners for their refusal to make provision for the repairs of the Library and a reasonable stipend for a Librarian. This churlish philistinism is, in the essayist's view, all part of their disregard of that peculiar and precious quality of the English Church, by virtue of which piety has marched hand in hand with genuine culture and sound learning.

suggestions for the continuance of the Catalogue of the Registers, Charters, Court Rolls, Surveys, Bulls, Briefs, Bibles and Service Books, and all the miscellaneous collections and unique treasures bequeathed by a long line of donors. The round peg was at length in the round hole; from Hoxton and Stepney had come a scholar not unworthy to stand in succession to Henry Wharton, Edmund Gibson, A. C. Ducarel, S. R. Maitland, Wm. Stubbs. Green held the Librarianship until his resignation in May, 1877; his renunciation of his Orders followed in the autumn of that year.

W. G. Addison.

CONFESSION IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

The Report of the Archbishops' Doctrinal Commission, under the heading "Confession and Absolution," notes the "widespread and increasing desire on the part of individuals to avail themselves of this direct and private ministry" as something by no means confined to one school of thought within the Church. When we remember the bitter controversies of the nineteenth century on this subject, the change of outlook and practice reflected here raises important questions. Sixty years ago, confession was taught and encouraged by no more than a small minority of clergy, in the face not only of popular suspicion, but also of strong ecclesiastical (and especially episcopal) opposition. While Lord Shaftesbury at large public meetings fulminated against confession as "a scandal to Holy Scripture," Bishops and Convocation expressed their fears and disapproval in more measured, but no less ambiguous, terms. Whether we are to regard the recent change of outlook as something alien from the Anglican tradition, or as the recovery of an Anglican heritage, will depend on our reading of the history and formularies of the Church of England. But even if we agree that the practice of regular confession involves no disloyalty to the Anglican tradition, the question will still remain whether its general commendation is not only lawful but expedient. The validity of the grounds on which the practice is being encouraged calls for a careful examination. Confession may be commended as a Catholic custom, the practice of which is required by the agelong discipline of the Universal Church. On the other hand, appeal may be made to its sacramental, pastoral and psychological value to the individual. This double appeal, to corporate discipline and individual need, must be studied in

the light of history and experience. But history and experience themselves, for a Christian, are subject to a further test—the judgment of the Gospel. We are left then with a final question: Does the practice of confession serve in any way as a witness to the truth of the Christian Revelation? If the answer to this question is positive, we shall have a third, an evangelical, ground of commendation, which will reveal both the strength and the limits of the other two.

If, as Hooker claimed, a "love of things ancient" is a mark of the Church of England, a custom which has behind it centuries of Christian experience at least demands serious consideration. Nevertheless we should do well to remember the ambiguity that lies in an appeal to Catholic custom. To some it will suggest the developments of mediæval (perhaps also of post-Reformation) Catholicism; to others, those factors which are common to Eastern and Western Christianity; to others again, the faith and practice of the primitive Church. The last interpretation is doubtless that of the English Reformers; applied, however, to the subject of confession it raises serious problems. There seems to be little in common between confession as it is normally understood and practised today and the exomologesis, or public discipline, of the early centuries. Confession and penance were then public acts required only of those who had fallen into serious and open sin. From the point of view of the Church, exomologesis was a necessary discipline for the preservation of its moral integrity in the face of a corrupt society. From the offender's point of view it was his second chance, the "second plank" on which he could save his baptismal privileges from shipwreck. Penance, in the primitive discipline, preceded absolution, both as a test of the offender's sincerity and a means of deepening his penitence; and if penance was imposed only for the gravest sins, absolution was offered to none more than once in his life. The primary purpose of exomologesis was disciplinary and judicial. The English Reformers appealed to this primitive custom as a "godly discipline," the restoration of which was "much to be wished."* The pious hope, however, has remained unfulfilled for four centuries, and public discipline is now claimed in the Commission's Report (p. 191) to be not only "difficult" but "undesirable." The change from public to private confession was indeed a necessary development: Hooker himself admits this; the Book of Common Prayer, by making provision for the latter, implies it. The change, however, was accompanied by a new interpretation of the disciplinary and judicial purpose of confession. Herein lay the problem for the Reformers. By the thirteenth century the

* Introduction to Commination Service.

discipline had come to be imposed not only on notorious sinners, but on all the faithful. Instead of being a means for the removal of excommunication, excommunication was now threatened to all who ignored it. The judicial element, too, underwent a change. Now it implied not the judgment of the Church on the sinner as a test of the reality of his penitence, but the judgment of the priest on the penitent's sins for the purpose of computing the amount of "satisfaction" required after absolution. It was this new judicial function of the priest that required from every penitent the detailed numbering of his sins (*in specie ac sigillatim*).* The change of practice was followed, as so often, by its theological justification. Satisfaction, in scholastic theology, is no longer the discharge of a duty to the Church for the sake of discipline, but the discharge of a debt to God's justice for the remission of temporal punishment. The practical abuses which followed the logic of the system gave, as everyone knows, an initial impetus to the Continental Reformation, and the English Reformers were faced with a peculiarly difficult problem. That they had no intention of surrendering the discipline of the Church and the judicial function of the ministry is sufficiently proved by their appeal to the "godly discipline" of primitive times. Since the restoration of this, however, was impracticable, they could hardly ignore the development of Church discipline in the intervening centuries. On the other hand, they could not accept the theology on which it had come to rest. We find, then, that private confession is retained, but with significant changes both in practice and theory. Extreme offenders, no doubt, could be excommunicated, and the curate of the parish is ordered to bring any "open and notorious evil liver" to an open declaration of repentance before allowing him to come to the Lord's Table.† For the rest, the altar is guarded by a solemn warning to intending communicants to examine their conscience, with an offer of private absolution and advice to those who require it (*cf.* the first exhortation in the Communion Office). The sick are to be "moved" by the priest, when he visits them, to make a "special confession" of their sins, if their conscience is troubled, and a judicial, indicative form of absolution (a form which goes back no farther than the thirteenth century) is provided. The words which speak of the Church's authority to "remit" and "retain" sins keep their place in the Ordinal, and here again the Reformers are content to follow a use which is comparatively late. Moreover, the very fact that private absolution is provided for presupposes that the priest is to judge whether

* Council of Trent: Sess. xiv., Cap 5, *De confes.*
† Second Rubric to Communion Office.

or not a man "humbly and heartily" desires it. Nevertheless, the disciplinary and judicial elements in confession have here undergone a significant change. The omission of all reference to the numbering of sins and the fact that no mention is made of penance imply a rejection of the mediæval theory of satisfaction. The priest becomes the judge of a man's penitence rather than of his sins. Confession is no longer of obligation, and those who seek absolution are free to choose their own confessor ("let him come to me or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's Word"). The discipline of confession then remains, but only where it is voluntarily accepted. However valuable it may be to accept this voluntary discipline, there is no Catholic custom to appeal to as of binding legal or moral force. Historical development and the deliberate policy of the English Reformers leave this in no kind of doubt. If, as Bishop Montague (1577-1641) maintained, confession is refused to none, urged upon some, and required in cases of perplexity, it would seem that the individual is left as the final judge of the degree of perplexity which requires it. The Church of England has no rule of confession.

We turn, then, to the second ground of its commendation, that of its personal benefit. Confession and absolution may be commended as a sacramental means of grace. Here the English Reformers again reject mediæval theory. The grace received in the very act of confession is, according to this theory, sufficient to turn an imperfect sorrow for sin (attrition) into true contrition. For the Reformers, on the other hand, penitence is the condition rather than the result of a true confession. It is true that absolution imparts a "benefit," the quieting of the conscience, which itself implies reconciliation with God, and if penance is not regarded as a sacrament in the full sense in which the term is applied to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, this is not, of course, to deny it the character of a sacramental rite. The Reformers are only anxious, in their careful choice of language, to guard against the suggestion that penance, as "one of those five commonly called sacraments," was ordained as a sacrament by Christ Himself and so "generally necessary for salvation" (Article XXV). But while we may regard confession and absolution as a sacramental means of grace, the Prayer Book references seem to imply that it will only be sought by those who are seriously troubled in conscience, and therefore will not be a regular feature of the normal Christian life. This, however, leaves open the question whether the conscience of every Christian should not be sufficiently sensitive to suggest to him the use of this ministry. If, then, we look at the practice of the Church as a commentary

on its formularies, we find that confession was by no means unknown and unpractised in the seventeenth century, the classic and formative period of Anglican history. That it not only might be, but was in fact, "made of excellent use" in his day is explicitly stated by the greatest of our moral theologians, Jeremy Taylor (1613-1667)*; we may appeal for further evidence to the 113th Canon of 1603 and the Ninth Constitution of the Convocation of 1640 and a number of Visitation Articles. Many of the leading Anglican divines of this period appear not only to have commended it, but to have practised it, and Hooker, Andrewes, Herbert, Cosin, to mention a few, can hardly be counted among notorious evil-doers! The fact that it fell into general disuse in the following century is of small weight against this testimony. The practice and commendation of confession by men who clearly accepted the Anglican view of its voluntary character suggests that they found in it both a means of grace and a pastoral value, and this is borne out in their writings. As to its pastoral value, the anonymous author of the devotional manual *The Whole Duty of Man* points out that "the truth is, we are so apt to favour ourselves, that it might be very useful for the most, especially the most ignorant sort, sometimes to advise with a spiritual guide to enable them to pass right judgments on themselves." If the giving of spiritual advice is not a necessary part of penance, it has come to be associated with it, and in the first exhortation in the Communion Office it stands in the closest connexion with the "benefit of absolution." It may be added that many have found a spiritual value in confession as an act of humility, a way of growth in penitence and a safeguard against moral slackness, and today we have to note further its commendation on psychological grounds. The close connection between some aspects of confession and certain kinds of psychological treatment is too obvious to be ignored. The release that comes from the sharing of secret fears, and the opportunity of the confessor to help the penitent by means of suggestion, may be offered as further examples of the value of confession. It must be noted, however, that confession has nothing to do with the unconscious mind, nor is it a cure for any form of mental disease: this is the function of psychotherapy. But it is precisely because of this limitation that psychologists are ready to give at least a guarded approval of the practice of regular confession.

It is possible, then, to appeal to the value of confession to the individual, but this appeal is by no means conclusive. If it may be claimed as a means of grace, it is not a necessary means

* *Cf. A Dissuasive from Popery*, I. ii. 4.

of forgiveness. If experience proves its pastoral value for many, people may claim that they can get sufficient advice in other ways and that their secret confession to God is already a sufficiently exacting spiritual discipline; and psychology provides a dubious court of appeal in a matter which concerns not merely the mental health of a patient, but the relation of the sinner to God. The discipline of the Church and the spiritual life of the individual, then, must be brought to a more fundamental test, which is that of the Gospel. It is not a question here of appeal to proof-texts, and it is clear that neither the practice of the Church nor the spiritual discipline of the individual in any age should be at the mercy of the commentator. And yet no question of discipline or ascetic theology can afford to neglect the constant check and challenge of Biblical study. The question is whether the practice of confession helps the Church and her members to bear witness to the *theologia crucis* which lies at the heart of the New Testament message.

The Cross bears witness, not to the particular sins of certain evil men, but to the sin of Man, the sin which is deeply rooted in the best that humanity has to shew. There is no such thing as an isolated act of sin: every act of sin reveals the character of the sinner and his share in the life of a fallen humanity. Moreover, growth in holiness involves a growth in the sense of sin, as St. Paul (and all other saints) have attested in calling themselves "chief of sinners." The call to repent, which is the first word of the Gospel, is a call to a lifelong and growing attitude of penitence towards God. This New Testament emphasis on sin has a double relevance to the practice of confession. In the first place, we have here too radical a view of sin to allow us to think of confession as a way (to borrow a phrase of William James) of keeping our account with evil "periodically squared and audited," though at the same time we are forbidden to treat sin as a purely abstract conception, apart from its manifestation in particular sins which form the subject-matter of confession. Secondly, and more positively, the truth that growth in character is also growth in penitence finds expression in the practice of regular confession, where the best and worst of men, the "saint" and the sinner, are brought (or rather bring themselves) to a common level of penitence before God. This is not, of course, to be confused with a morbid preoccupation with sin. Penitence does not involve introspection or gloom. We have as the second New Testament truth the fact of forgiveness. If the first word of the Gospel is Repent, the second is the Coming of the Kingdom, the New Age, which brings with it deliverance from sin. The Cross means the restoration of man, his reconciliation with God.

But this pardon is not to be found through much introspection, nor does it consist in any number of inner feelings. It is the authoritative word of God: Thy sins are forgiven. Again there is a relevance here to confession. In the ministry of reconciliation the priest is not primarily a judge or an adviser, but a minister of the Word. Confession, then, gives the opportunity of hearing and of personally appropriating this word of forgiveness, and so bears witness to its objective character, to the fact that the sense of forgiveness is not an inherent right of man, but a God-given gift.

Thirdly, there is the reality of the Church. The new relationship of man to God in Christ involves the New Israel, the People of God. The Church is the sphere in which the Divine forgiveness is both proclaimed and appropriated, because it is the Body of Christ. No man sins to himself: the Body of Christ is broken by the sins of all its members. Restoration of fellowship with God must also mean the renewal of fellowship with the Family of God. Confession again bears witness to the corporate nature of sin and forgiveness. Confession to God in the presence of another, a representative of the Christian Society, is a way of declaring our unity with the Church both in sin and restoration, the fact that when we sin and when we are raised up it is not as isolated individuals but as members of the Family.

It may be urged that the general confession and absolution of the Church's Services are a witness to the New Testament truth of sin, forgiveness and the Church, and this is true. We may go further and say that the very fact that private confession is not exacted as an obligation itself has value in pointing to the freedom of Christian fellowship and the free operation of God's grace. That some should not see the value of the private ministry also calls for the exercise of Christian charity by those who do. But the private ministry has its own value in its call to the individual Christian to face a deliberate and costly act of witness to the evangelical truth. Regular confession does not, of course, imply frequent confession, and the frequency of the practice for any individual must be determined by pastoral, and perhaps psychological, considerations. But we may well find the ultimate justification of periodic confession in the witness it bears to the reality of sin, the objective character of forgiveness and the all-embracing claims of the Christian Fellowship. It is in the relation of confession to these truths that we shall be able to give due weight, and to set due limits, to the appeal which may be made to agelong custom and individual needs. Every custom, every individual sense of need, must face the final judgment of a theology which is true

to the fundamental truths of Scripture. This, for the Church of England, is a basic principle, and it might have been even more clearly emphasized than it is in what the Doctrinal Report has to say of confession. There is an urgent need today that not only those who continue to regard the practice of regular confession with suspicion, but the increasing number of those who are ready to commend it, should bring their convictions and practice to the final test of the evangelical message.

W. S. T. WRIGHT.

THE FAITH OF CRANMER*

" . . . HE declared "—that is, Cranmer declared, and he was speaking to King Henry—" that if he accepted the office " (*i.e.*, the Archbishopric) " then he must receive it at the pope's hand; which he neither would nor could do, for that his highness was only the supreme governor of this church of England, as well in causes ecclesiastical as temporal. . . . And therefore, if he might in that vocation serve God, him and his country, seeing it was his pleasure so to have it, he would accept it and receive it of his majesty, and of none other stranger, who had no authority within this realm."†

That statement is from Fox, but it can be proved true; and it is quoted here in order to show what Cranmer thought of the Pope at the time of his appointment to the Archbishopric of Canterbury. It had been while he was divinity lecturer in Jesus College, Cambridge, that his churchmanship was formed; and though, indeed, his mind, like the minds of all thoughtful men, continued throughout his life to work to further conclusions, and though his views on the Sacrament changed afterwards, yet the foundation of his faith was firm by 1532.

Three years later he gives this account of two sermons which he preached in Canterbury Cathedral. " First, I declared that the bishop of Rome was not God's vicar in earth, as he was taken; and although it was so taught these three or four hundred years, yet it was done by means of the bishop of Rome, who compelled men by oaths so to teach, to the maintenance of his authority, contrary to God's word. . . .

" Second, because the see of Rome was called *sancta sedes Romana*, and the bishop was called *sanctissimus papa*; and men's consciences peradventure could not be quiet to be separated

* All the quotations in this essay are taken from *The Works of Archbishop Cranmer* (Parker Society).

† Vol. ii., p. 223.

from so holy a place, and from God's most holy vicar; I shewed the people that this thing ought nothing to move them, for it was but a holiness in name; for indeed there was no such holiness at Rome. . . .

"Third, I spoke against the bishop of Rome, his laws; which he calleth *divinas leges* and *sacros canones*, and maketh them equal with God's law. And here I declared that many of his laws were contrary to God's laws. And some of them which were good and laudable, yet they were not of such holiness as he would make them; that is, to be taken as God's laws, or to have remission of sins by observing of them. . . ."*

In short, the Popes made the canon law, the canon law made the Popes, and then each claimed infallibility for the other, alleging that whoever does not receive the decrees of the Bishop of Rome blasphemes the Holy Spirit and shall have no forgiveness. But this is not the catholic faith. Christ gave no such authority to any man, nor yet did the General Councils and the ancient doctors. It is the law of God, not the law of man, says the catholic faith, that must be obeyed; and the law of God is found in the Scriptures.

What was Cranmer's attitude to the Bible is constantly shewn both by his words and deeds. "In the scriptures be the fat pastures of the soul; therein is no venomous meat, no unwholesome thing; they be the very dainty and pure feeding. He that is ignorant shall find there what he should learn. He that is a perverse sinner shall there find his damnation to make him to tremble for fear. He that laboureth to serve God shall find there his glory, and the promises of eternal life, exhorting him more diligently to labour. . . . Here may all manner of persons, men, women, young, old, learned, unlearned, rich, poor, priests, laymen, lords, ladies, officers, tenants, and mean men, virgins, wives, widows, lawyers, merchants, artificers, husbandmen, and all manner of persons, of what estate or condition soever they be, may in this book learn all things what they ought to believe, what they ought to do, and what they should not do, as well concerning Almighty God, as also concerning themselves and all other.† . . . Every man that cometh to the reading of this holy book ought to bring with him first and foremost this fear of Almighty God, and then next a firm and stable purpose to reform his own self according thereunto."‡

There are, moreover, Cranmer's often repeated injunctions, not only that the Bible and the Paraphrases of Erasmus should be set up in every church, but also that the clergy should

* Vol. ii., p. 326. † Vol. ii., p. 121. ‡ Vol. ii., p. 124.

themselves possess Bibles, or at the least Testaments, both in Latin and English; that they should begin at the beginning of the book, and every day read a chapter, comparing the two versions together, till they had gone right through it to the end. For it seemed to Cranmer that if he could but root and ground the people in the Bible, they would be rooted and grounded in truth.

So, then, the Scriptures are the only rule of the faith of Christians. They are a true, sound, perfect and whole doctrine, containing all things necessary for salvation. It is, therefore, most important that the people should be encouraged to reverence these laws of God, which are necessary for salvation, more than the laws of men, which are not necessary. And when the two laws clash, the laws of men must be rejected. But many of the laws and ceremonies of men are good. They were first instituted in the church for the sake of order, as remembrances of holy things and incitements to virtue; and as such people ought to reverence them, though not with the idea that the bare observation of them is in itself a holiness.

The Institution of a Christian Man, which is an explication of their faith, drawn up by the bishops, was published in 1537. Soon afterwards the king submitted for Cranmer's criticism a number of corrections of the book which he himself had made. To read the king's corrections and Cranmer's notes on the corrections is almost like hearing the two men talk. In the following examples passages from the *Institution* are written in italics, and dashes mark the king's suggestions or amendments.

"*Thou shalt not desire thy neighbour's house, his wife, his servant, his maid, his ox, his ass, ne anything that is his*—wrongfully or unjustly."—Cranmer answers, "We may not thus add to the words of Scripture, but set them out first plainly and surely, even as they be, and after expound and declare them."

—" . . . We be assured that as death could not hold Christ, even so it cannot hold us which are by a Christian faith the very members and body of Christ, but that we shall rise from death and live again, if we order and conform our will in this world to his precepts."—Cranmer answers, "Whether we order our will to his precepts or not, we shall rise from death to life, but not to the glorious life. And yet to the glorious life also shall we rise, though we have not in all things conformed our will to God's will, but have repugned to his will, so that we be repentant and amend, as David, Peter and Paul did. And the true faithful man endeavoureth himself to conform his will to God's will in all things, and to walk right forth in all his

precepts. And where by infirmity he chanceth to take a fall, he lieth not still, but by God's help riseth again. And his trust is so much in God, that he doubteth not in God's goodness toward him, but that if by fragility and weakness he fall again, God will not suffer him so to lie still, but put his hand to him and help him up again, and so at the last he will take him up from death unto the life of glory everlasting."

"*The penitent must conceive certain hope and faith that God will forgive him his sins, and repute him justified, and of the number of his elect children, not*—only—*for the worthiness of any merit or work done by the penitent, but*—chiefly—*for the only merits of the blood and passion of our Saviour Jesus Christ.*" Cranmer answers, "Only, chiefly. These two words may not be put in in this place in any wise: for they signify that our election and justification cometh partly of our merits, though chiefly it cometh of the goodness of God. But certain it is that our election cometh only and wholly of the benefit and grace of God, for the merits of Christ's passion, and for no part of our merits and good works."

"*But like as we*—ought to—*forgive them heartily which trespass against us, even so we beseech thee forgive us.*" Cranmer answers, "Christ taught us not here in this petition to pray unto our Father that he should forgive us as we 'ought to' forgive other: meaning thereby that unless we forgive other in deed, our prayer is frustrate and made in vain."

—"Here is a thing greatly to be noted in comfort of the true labouring man: for surely, be he craftsman, be he labourer, he doing truly his office whereto he is called, shall attain salvation as surely as any other creature, and they that do contrary shall be in jeopardy of damnation."—Cranmer answers, "This is a good saying."

—". . . Having assured hope and confidence in Christ's mercy, willing to enter into the perfect faith."—Cranmer answers, "He that hath assured hope and confidence in Christ's mercy hath already entered into a perfect faith, and not only hath a will to enter into it. For perfect faith is nothing else but assured hope and confidence in Christ's mercy."*

Cranmer dealt more fully with this subject of faith in two sermons. They are good sermons, full of sober thoughtfulness, although to modern ears they repeat themselves. Shortly, the argument is as follows: Because all men are sinners, therefore no man can by his own acts be justified and made righteous before God; but every man must seek for another justification, to be received at God's own hands, that is the remission, pardon

* Vol. ii., pp. 83-114.

and forgiveness of his sins. There are three things which must go together in our justification: on God's part, His great mercy and grace in sending His only Son into the world; on Christ's part, justice, in paying our ransom and fulfilling the Law; and on our part, true and lively faith in the mercy of God and the merits of Christ. So when St. Paul and the old doctors of the Church teach that "faith only justifieth," they must not be misunderstood. Justification, as has been said, is the office of God; it is not a thing which we render unto Him, but which we receive of Him; and the meaning of "justification by faith" is not that our own act of believing can merit our forgiveness; but that, renouncing our own virtues, faith, hope, charity, repentance, dread, fear of God as far too weak, we put our faith in the sacrifice which the Son of God once offered for us upon the cross. Our faith, as it were, says to us, "It is not I that take away your sins, but Christ, and to Him only I send you for that purpose."

In the Scripture faith is taken in two ways. There is one faith which, though it believes indeed in the articles of our faith, yet brings forth no good works, but is idle, barren, and unfruitful: this is dead faith, and cannot save sinners. But the right and true Christian faith not only believes in the articles, but also has sure trust and confidence that God regards us and cares for us as a father for the child whom he loves. As the light cannot be hidden, so this faith cannot be kept secret, but must show itself by good works; and seeing what God has done for us it moves us to serve and please Him, to keep His favour, to fear His displeasure, to continue His obedient children, showing thankfulness by keeping His commandments —and this for true love chiefly, not for dread of punishment. Therefore when men fancy that faith sets them at liberty from doing good works, they trifle with God and deceive themselves. "He that saith I know God," says St. John, "and keepeth not His commandments, he is a liar." Let us therefore be sure of our faith, let us try it by our living and examine its fruits, for unless charity follow it it is not the lively Christian faith.*

Martin. ". . . You, Master Cranmer, have taught in this high sacrament of the altar three contrary doctrines . . ."

Cranmer. "Nay, I taught but two contrary doctrines in the same."

Martin. "What doctrine taught you when you condemned Lambert, the sacramentary, in the king's presence in Whitehall ?"

* See vol. ii., pp. 128-141.

Cranmer. "I maintained then the papists' doctrine . . ."

Martin. ". . . And for the same heresy you did help to burn Lambert the sacramentary, which you now call the catholic faith and God's word."

Cranmer. "I grant that then I believed otherwise than I do now; and so I did until my lord of London, Dr. Ridley, did confer with me, and by sundry persuasions and authorities of doctors drew me quite from my opinion."*

This dialogue is from Cranmer's examination before the Pope's representative. It would perhaps be possible to shew that his change of belief had not been as sudden as at that moment he remembered it to have been, or at any rate that Dr. Ridley's seed fell on well-prepared soil. But here there is only room for the belief which is consonant with the rest of his mature thought, the belief which he records in his book, *The Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist*, and with which his trials were largely concerned.

"It is," he wrote, "so holy a thing, and the threatenings of God be so sore against them that come thereto unworthily, that an ungodly man abhorreth it, and not without cause dare in no wise approach thereunto. But to them that live godly it is the greatest comfort that in this world can be imagined. And the more godly a man is, the more sweetness and spiritual pleasure and desire he shall have often to receive it."†

Now when Christ gave bread to His disciples, and said, "This is My Body," it is evident—and the old doctors affirm—that He called bread His Body. So if this speech is plainly understood it must mean that bread is Christ's Body, and that Christ's Body is bread. But this is not true. "And so the old doctors do call this speaking of Christ tropical, figurative, anagogical, allegorical; which they do interpret after this sort, that although the substance of bread and wine do remain, and be received of the faithful, yet notwithstanding, Christ changed the appellation thereof, and called the bread by the name of His flesh and the wine by the name of His blood, *non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio—i.e.*, 'not that it is so in very deed, but signified in a mystery': so that we should consider not what they be in their own nature, but what they import to us and signify; and should understand the sacrament not carnally but spiritually. . . . Being no less assured and certified that we are fed spiritually unto eternal life by Christ's flesh crucified, and by His blood shed, the true food of our minds, than that our bodies be fed with meat and drink in this life; and hereof this mystical bread on the table of Christ, and the mystical

* Vol. ii., p. 218 (Fox).

† Vol. ii., p. 174.

wine, being administered and received after the institution of Christ, be to us a memorial, a pledge, a token, a sacrament, and a seal." . . . It is as if Christ said to us, " ' The bread and the wine which be set before your eyes are only declarations of me, but I myself am the eternal food. Wherefore, whensoever at this my table you shall behold the sacraments, have not regard so much to them, as consider ye what I promise to you by them, which is myself, to be meat for you of eternal life.' "*

The last quotation is from Fox again. It is taken from *The Tenor of the Appeal of the Archbishop of Canterbury from the Pope to the next General Council.* The words, therefore, may not be Cranmer's, but because they are so good a summary of his attitude to authority they are set here. " And touching my doctrine of the sacrament, and other my doctrine, of what kind soever it be, I protest that it was never my mind to write, speak or understand any thing contrary to the most holy word of God, or else against the holy catholic church of Christ; but purely and simply to imitate and teach those things only which I have learned of the sacred scripture, and of the holy catholic church of Christ from the beginning, and also according to the exposition of the most holy and learned fathers and martyrs of the church."†

CONSTANCE BICKERSTETH.

SOME IDEALS OF A THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE

THE appointment by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York of a Commission to study the ideals and methods of the training of the clergy, both before and after ordination, is causing much re-thinking of the whole problem. Without claiming to prejudice the issue or attempting to be dogmatic, and realizing that all present and future training is subject to the limitations of existing conditions which cannot easily be changed, it may be worth while to set down a few ideas and conditions, the fruit of a good many years of experience, which bear upon the general question. Some suggestions are obviously not feasible in all instances, but others may be, and those of us who are engaged in this vitally important work may find them helpful, especially those who are only beginners (the writer has most grateful recollections of a conference on the subject held under the auspices of the S.C.M. at Cambridge in 1921).

* Vol. i., pp. 398-9. Original in Latin. † Vol. ii., p. 227.

The training of a minister of God involves all the parts of man's nature, and a college has to train him specially in the consecration of his will, his emotions and affections, and make him pure and strong in the things of the spirit; it means producing as far as possible in him "the mind of Christ"—*i.e.*, character-making is the first objective. To this end serve the chapel addresses, the silences, meditation times, quiet days and retreats, and the administration of discipline; the inculcation of self-discipline, of habits of devotion, order, tidiness, regularity, punctuality, obedience to authority, considerateness for others; everything in fact which presents the student with his ideal and urges and helps him towards it.

The second objective is training in the practical activities of the ministry, and this means imparting a certain amount of knowledge, but as the time of training is short it means rather the mapping out of the ground to be covered, giving the student a bird's-eye view, giving him the interest and the habit and the methods of study, stimulating and training him to think, and shewing him the problems at issue and the material available. His work will embrace the fourfold activities of prophet, priest, king and wise man. As prophet he is entrusted with a message, and therefore he must know and understand what his message is. Each religious body lays down its requirements in the way of Biblical, doctrinal and historical knowledge, and this will be studied, not academically, but humanly, as originating in man's own problems of experience, both individual and corporate, and every detail will be related to and its bearing shewn on the actual problems of the life of the day. The chapel addresses will be based on the fundamentals of the Christian religion—*i.e.*, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, the Sacraments, the Gifts and the Fruits of the Spirit; they will also deal with such subjects as the seven deadly sins and the questions in the Ordinal. The art of preaching and methods and conditions of evangelism will be studied; also the art of teaching and theories and methods of education, and the lines and methods of defending the faith against attacks and error. As priest the minister leads his people in worship; hence liturgical study and practice in conducting services. As wise man he must study human nature, which involves some psychology, and learn the difficult art of dealing with individuals in their mental and moral and spiritual difficulties. This also means ethics and ascetic theology, but it should be said at once that the latter and the subject of soul-handling is better left for post-ordination study if possible. The kingly aspect of the ministry comes out in the duty of leadership and the organization and control of the life and

work of a parish or congregation and its relation to the larger life of the Church, in its business side and its relation to the State. All four aspects can be summed up as pastoral, and this latter aspect includes, further, visiting, social activities, clubs, guilds, etc. In all these instruction will be given, and in relation to the varying types of congregation and parish where men serve, and it will include as far as possible some actual practical experience in local parishes and settlements.

The usual method of instruction will be by lecture. The seminary system, by which a subject is studied and then discussed by a group under a skilled leader, is undoubtedly the best method, but time will not allow it, except, perhaps, with men who have finished their examinations and are waiting for ordination. So the lecturer must aim at imparting the main outlines of his subject, stimulating thought, arousing interest; he will not do for the student what the student ought to do for himself; he will not spoon-feed and his lectures will not consist of *résumés* of textbooks; he will dictate special notes at times, but will usually "speak at large." He should be a master of his subject and familiar with the leading theories and literature, but remember that he is dealing with beginners and not scholars. A good deal of useful work on special subjects, such as social and industrial problems and other problems of the day, can be done by debates, introduced either by students themselves or by experts coming specially for the purpose; also by visits to factories and industrial areas.

What of the staff? This in the smaller colleges will never consist of less than two resident, and it may be more, and it will include visiting teachers from the clergy of the neighbourhood, men duly qualified to teach one or more subjects and glad of the opportunity to do so; this makes for variety and breadth of view as well as efficiency, and relieves the burden of the resident staff. There may also be lecturers who come at intervals for an intensive week on subjects such as psychology, teaching, preaching. Sometimes a student-tutor is appointed, but this is not to be commended; it means that as student he has not enough time for his own studies, and as tutor his work is hurried and therefore inefficient; the practice is not fair to either the man himself or to the other students. Of the Principal, on whom the whole life and *ethos* of the college depends, the essentials are that he be a man of the Spirit, of personal devotion; if the clergy are to be leaders, pioneers of the Christian ideal, "lights in the world," they must be shewn what a life thoroughly devoted to our Lord and imbued with His Spirit is like; they must have the ideal daily before them in a personal example and be fired to attain it themselves. Closely following

this, he must be a man who can manage men, a disciplinarian; in all ages discipline is needed; from our own it has nearly vanished and needs to be regained; and the clergy, if they are to help others to the ideal, and if they are to help the work of the Church, must themselves first learn self-discipline and the need and the habit of obedience to lawful authority. The Principal should have " a way with him," be a " personality," and also be a judge of men, for it should always be recognized that a student's course includes testing as to his vocation and suitability, as well as training, for the ministry. He should have had parish experience, but he need not be a great scholar or teacher as long as he can find others to help him who are.

How large should a college be ? Large enough to allow for variety among the students and a wide interchange of view and experience, and also to make the college self-sufficient in the matter of games, on which not only physical health depends, but which are also valuable means of moral training and testing. At the same time the college must not be so large that men break up into cliques. The family atmosphere and spirit are to be aimed at so that all, staff and students, may know one another intimately; the limits are roughly represented by 30-40. A daily " chapter " of the whole college, lasting only a few minutes, effectively fosters this spirit, and is a useful opportunity of giving out notices and information and exchanging ideas. It is not possible to have a " colourless " college—some general standard of Church views and practice is inevitable; but a college need not and should not be partisan or factious, narrow-minded or unsympathetic. As to college rules, that community is always happiest which has the fewest and those mostly unwritten. Medical treatment may be economically provided by arrangement with the local doctors on the lines of a Medical Benefit Club and with the nearest hospital through its League.

Where should a college be situated ? A strong case is sometimes urged for a university city, where the best of scholarship and learning can be found and correspondingly less heavy teaching demands made on the staff; but the atmosphere of a university city is not always the best for the devotional preparation for the ministry; also the newer universities mostly lack theological faculties; if it were possible for all students to graduate first and pass to a theological college later, both advantages would be secured. Neither a country site nor a large town is to be commended, because isolation is as undesirable as immersion in ceaseless and multifarious activity; but contact with both should be aimed at, in order to give some awareness of modern life in its many aspects *plus* some detachment from it. A cathedral city may provide

both and add not a little inspiration and valuable practical experience, as well as the additional help on the staff already mentioned.

S. P. T. Prideaux.

PISIDIAN ANTIOCH AND THE XENOI TEKMOREIOI

I. PISIDIAN ANTIOCH

The City and its History

When Paul and Barnabas first came to Pisidian Antioch they came by way of Apollonia along the road to Syria, and entered by the southern gate into the city.

To enter from the north would probably be more usual nowadays. This would mean starting from Ak-Shehir, a station on the Bagdad Railway (the ancient Philomelium, best known from the Letters of St. Ignatius and the eccentricities of the mediæval Hodja Nasr-ed-din, and still retaining extensive ruins of an ancient medressé), and crossing the Sultan Dagh mountain by a narrow path where only the surefootedness of the mule saves the traveller from crashing down into the ravine far below. On descending the western slope of the mountain, the site of Pisidian Antioch comes into view, and the last part of the journey is by the side of the ruins of the ancient aqueduct.

Pisidian Antioch has a fine natural situation,* and, though it is now deserted, a little more than a mile to the south is the modern Turkish town of Yalovach. The ancient city occupies a rectangular site on a low plateau rising somewhat steeply from the Anthios glen on the east and sloping down westwards towards the plain. On the east, along one of the longer sides, flows the River Anthios, with the Sultan Dagh mountain beyond. About fifteen miles to the south-west is the double lake Limnai —Egerdir Gol and Hoiran Gol.

The plateau was at one time surrounded by high walls some two miles in circumference. A strong fortress was needed to meet the attacks of the fierce tribes of the Pisidian Mountains. Antioch was chosen for this purpose by Seleucus Nicator, *c.* 300 B.C., not only because of its strategic position near Lake Limnai on an important route to the East, but also because of its natural advantages. In this respect, a chief consideration was an excellent supply of water from the Sultan Dagh several

* *Cf.* Ramsay, *Cities of St. Paul*, pp. 247 *ff.*

miles distant. The water flowed along an underground conduit for the greater part of the way, but for the last mile above ground by means of an aqueduct, the ruins of which are still the most impressive part of the remains of Pisidian Antioch. The proximity of the River Anthios, along the eastern wall of the city, would obviate any danger caused by an enemy destroying the aqueduct.

The impressiveness of the site of Pisidian Antioch is marred today by an air of desolation. The striking ruins of the ancient aqueduct extend for over a mile. Otherwise there is nothing now standing that is sufficiently conspicuous to catch the eye from a distance. On the north-east, the highest part of the plateau, the remains of an ancient theatre, cut into the rocks and semicircular in shape, show the holes, a foot square, where beams for a platform had been inserted. Apparently when Hamilton visited the site the ruins were more extensive and included a portico.

A considerable part of the ancient buildings has been removed and used to build the modern Yalovach. Inscribed stones from the ancient site are found in the Turkish cemetery and built into the walls of the Turkish town. Several of the inscriptions were copied by the writer in 1919. They had, of course, been previously discovered and included in Professor Sterrett's *Epigraphical Journey in Asia Minor*. Pisidian Antioch was so called to distinguish it from Syrian Antioch. According to Strabo (577) it was the city of Phrygia towards Pisidia. Ramsay insists that it was a city of Phrygia in the geographical sense, and a city of the Province Galatia in the political sense.

When Seleucus Nicator founded Pisidian Antioch he did not make use of, and transform, an already-existing city. On the contrary, Antioch was a new foundation, in which a large body of colonists from Magnesia formed the majority of the population. But the population included a considerable native element also, since the city was intended not merely as a fortress (on the most important strategic point, and with the best water supply in the district), but also as a centre from which civilizing influences might permeate the native people in the surrounding country.

In Antioch, however, the native element of the population did not act as intermediaries to the same extent as in the other Seleucid garrison cities, and the gulf between the foreign colonists and the natives largely remained whilst the Hellenizing influence was less effective. This cannot be accounted for solely by assuming a larger proportion than usual of colonists to natives. There seem to have been other

influences at work causing the native peoples of the surrounding country to retain their own character and their own Phrygian customs.

The country between Pisidian Antioch and Lake Limnai, more particularly the villages round the north and east shores of the lake, had formed the estates of the ancient God of Antioch. This country persisted in Phrygian manners and religion little affected by the Hellenizing influence of the city. The evidence of coins and inscriptions shews that Men or Manes was the chief God of Antioch. He is represented on coins as fully draped and bearing the characteristic high-pointed Phrygian cap.* But not less important in the eyes of the Phrygian people was the female Goddess, the Great Mother. A cave near Lake Limnai was once the sanctuary of this Goddess, and when the place of the pagan Goddess was taken by the Virgin Mother of God, Christians from afar paid an annual pilgrimage to the spot.† That the custom still obtains I gathered from the Turkish schoolmaster of Yalovach; but we were forced to talk in French, and as his knowledge of French was no better than my own our conversation was not as enlightening as could be wished.

Shortly before the Great War the long-lost Hieron, or holy place of the God Men, was discovered by Miss Hardie.‡

The shrine was reached by crossing the River Anthios and climbing a spur of the Sultan Dagh to a height of about 5,000 ft. Towards the end of the climb the path showed signs of having been once the made road of the ancient Sacred Way. Sculptures were discovered on the rocks, and the ruins of a Christian church were found. Then the path led to the remains of a small theatre, hollowed out of the hill, with statue bases on either side, and finally to the ruins of a small building—a great altar rather than a temple—the Hieron of the God Men.

Stones from the Hieron had been used for building the church. It would seem that the site had always been a sacred one, however different may have been the religious view of those who worshipped there.

II. THE XENOI TEKMOREIOI

In June, 1882, Sir W. M. Ramsay was making his way to Pisidian Antioch from Apollonia along the same route as that by which Paul and Barnabas first came to the city.§ When

* Is the headdress of the Mevlevi (Dancing) dervishes of Koniah a relic of this?

† *Cf.* Ramsay, *E.R.P.*, pp. 375-6; *Hist. Geog.*, p. 414; Sterrett, *Epigraphical Journey in Asia Minor*, p. 412.

‡ *Cf. Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1912.

§ *Cf. Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1883, pp. 23 *ff.*, and 1912, pp. 151 *ff.*, and *E.R.P.*, pp. 314 *ff.*

within a few miles of his objective, near the village of Gondane, Professor Ramsay passed a cemetery in which he noticed a pillar of unusual, elliptical shape, 11½ ft. high, with a small portion broken off at the top. On examining the pillar he found that it bore a long and important inscription reaching to within a foot or so of the bottom.* The lettering was rude in character and obviously not the work of a skilled craftsman. There was a want of evenness about the lines, whilst the letters varied in size and form, and also in the depth to which they were cut.

Nor was the inscription itself the work of a scholar. It contained mistakes in grammar as well as in spelling. The wording was in Greek, but the sort of Greek that would be used by a people more familiar with their own Phrygian tongue.†

The information afforded by the inscription was confined almost entirely to giving a list of people, to each of whom was added the name of a village, and a sum of so many denarii given, apparently, in the nature of a subscription. The largest subscription was 6,000 denarii, and as this would have been at that time equivalent to about £6 at the present day, the amounts indicate a condition of very considerable prosperity.‡

An examination of the places mentioned shewed that most of them were situated in the neighbourhood of Lake Limnai, on the northern and eastern sides. The most important place was Saghir, a somewhat remote spot high up in the Sultan Dagh. Gondane, where the pillar was found, came next in importance, as might be expected from its position on the great road to Syria from Apollonia.

The inscription began at the top of the column where a portion of the stone had been lost. From what remained it seemed that the subscriptions appended to the names were given for the purpose of providing for the making of statues of the Good Fortune of the Emperor and of the great goddess Artemis.§ Although certain articles are specified, the money contributed was much larger than would be needed for them alone, and the occurrence of the word "dipylon"|| indicated that extensive work on the temple of the goddess was the chief purpose of the subscription list.

Articles mentioned, in smaller lettering, as having been

* A rough facsimile of part of the inscription is given in Ramsay, *Eastern Roman Provinces*, p. 320.

† The inscription is given in full as R.I. in *E.R.P.*, pp. 319 *ff.*, and as St. 366 in Sterrett, *Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor*, pp. 226-273.

‡ "At the present day it would usually be impossible to find change for a coin, value under four shillings, by combining the whole monetary resources of a large village" (*E.R.P.*, p. 372).

§ *Cf. Pauline Studies*, p. 114.

|| *Cf. E.R.P.*, p. 349.

made by subscribers at their own expense, are a phiale or chalice, chalkomata or bronze plates used for material on which to engrave inscriptions, patellæ or patens to contain the food served to a god, and a libanotris or censer.*

The meaning of this subscription list was obscure till the discovery in 1885 of further similar lists by Professor Sterrett of America. These are given as Nos. 367, 370, 372 in his *Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor*, published by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.†

In these lists the subscribers are styled Xenoi Tekmoreioi. The clue to their meaning was the word "Tekmor," an ancient word which had gone out of use. Professor Sterrett thought the word "Tekmoreioi" referred to the name of some village;‡ but the verbal form τεκμορεύσας proved the decisive passage, inspiring Sir W. M. Ramsay with the brilliant suggestion that the word "Tekmor" referred to some sign or pledge and was then used as the root of a verb. "The following are they that shewed the Tekmor in the year when . . ."

The fact that Lucius of Gissa (near Ak-Shehir) τεκμορεύσας δίς § proved "that the whole series of inscriptions record the performances of a certain action, τεκμορεύειν, by a series of individuals, who evidently were styled τεκμορεῖον after they ἐτεκμόρευσαν."‖

Professor Ramsay quotes the Tekmoreioi as an example of the brotherhoods characteristic of Anatolian Society in his *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia.*¶

The whole style and character of the inscriptions clearly indicated that this sharing of the Tekmor was connected with religious rites as an important part of the old Anatolian religion.

Further light was thrown on the inscriptions when it was seen that the subscribers came for the most part from villages in a particular geographical area—viz., that part of the country round Pisidian Antioch which in the pre-Hellenic Anatolian period belonged to the God Men.** These estates, after passing to the kings in the Hellenistic period, became the property of the Roman Emperors.††

Part was given by them as a provision for the new colonists, whilst the villages covered by the subscription lists represented

* *Cf.* Sterrett, *Wolfe Expedition*, No. 366.
† And also in *E.R.P.*, pp. 319 *ff.* *Cf.* also Ramsay, *Hist. Geog.*, p. 410.
‡ *Cf. E.R.P.*, pp. 317, 346.
§ *E.R.P.*, p. 330, l. 34.
‖ *E.R.P.*, p. 346.
¶ i., p. 97, ii., pp. 359, 630. *Cf. E.R.P.*, p. 318.
** *E.R.P.*, pp. 305-378.
†† *E.R.P.*, pp. 305, 306, and *Hist. Geog.*, p. 177. Evidence re Philenus the priest and Nilus the imperial slave is given in list R., 1905. *Cf. E.R.P.*, pp. 309, 310.

what was left of the land that originally was the property of the god.*

Here was retained the old social system of Phrygia, which, in contrast to the πόλις system of the Greeks, had its hieron or religious sanctuary in a remote spot outside the city, and "an organization in a collegium for religious purposes."†

"These Guest friends," writes Professor Ramsay, "were really the plebs collegii on the Antiochian estates."

The date of the inscriptions is given by Professor Ramsay as about A.D. 225,‡ and he explains that in the third century the characteristic feature of the religion of the imperial estates was that it united God and the Emperor.

The imperial estates were the "stronghold of paganism in Asia Minor . . . the centres of the anti-Christian movement and the pagan revivals."§

Hence the Tekmor is an addition to the rites of the ancient religion and was shewn or given as a pledge of loyalty to the Roman Emperor.

Two interesting facts emerge from a consideration of these inscriptions:

(*a*) This giving of the Tekmor was used as a test for Christians.

Sir W. M. Ramsay stresses the fact that the war between the State and Christianity was "the greatest political fact of the third century." The period was characterized by a great revival of the pagan religions which combined with the new feature of emperor-worship to strengthen the opposition to this new Christian faith.‖

Professor Collingwood adduces¶ an inscription from a villa near Bath as evidence of the existence of similar imperial estates in Britain. He refers to new pagan temples being built in Britain and "maintained on a considerable scale," and instances the Giant column at Cirencester, the only one of its kind in Britain. He adds, "It seems that paganism was meeting the challenge of Christianity by special efforts."**

The revival of paganism and the persecution of Christianity regularly went together, and the usual test of loyalty required from one suspected of Christian leanings was the public offering of incense to the Emperor.

* *E.R.P.*, p. 307.

† *E.R.P.*, pp. 308, 309.

‡ He points out that there are two groups of Tekmoreian lists, and he gives A.D. 215-225 as the date of the earlier and 245-255 for the later. *Cf. Pauline Studies*, p. 117, and *E.R.P.*, pp. 349, 350.

§ *Pauline Studies*, pp. 121-122.

‖ *Cf.* Ramsay, *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 109; *Pauline Studies*, pp. 106 *ff.*

¶ R. G. Collingwood, "Roman Britain" (*Ox. Hist. Eng.*), p. 221.

** *Ibid.*, p. 273 (*cf.* p. 305).

The Tekmor was an alternative or additional pledge of loyalty to the State. The Xenoi Tekmoreioi of Pisidian Antioch were those who had given this pledge. Lucius of Gissa gave it twice—τεκμορεύσας δίς*—and we wonder what tragedy of recantation lies behind that brief and bald statement!

Those who had given the Tekmor and had their names on one of these lists were in a position similar to that of those who carried a libellus—*i.e.*, certified as loyal adherents of the Emperor and the State religion.

Professor Ramsay refers to official certificates of loyalty given to those who had satisfied the requirements of the imperial religion.† He mentions that three of these certificates have been found in Egypt.‡

(*b*) The other feature indicated by these inscriptions is that the religious rites of the Xenoi Tekmoreioi included a meal which was apparently intended as a parody of the Christian Eucharist.

In the Greco-Roman world a meal which included some form of sacrifice was a usual feature of the various religious societies.

There were two officials of the Tekmoria Societies. The leader is called Protanaclites, indicating that the mystic ritual included a common meal at which he presided. There were also officials, appointed annually, called Brabeutai,§ who acted as stewards or auditors in managing the financial side of the societies' work, and also performed certain duties in carrying out the festival rites of the societies.

In this Tekmoreian meal there is a definite resemblance to the Christian Eucharist. For it was characteristic of the ritual that the newly initiated should be given the dipyros or twice-fired bread. This twice-fired bread served as a Tekmor or pledge of loyalty to the State religion, with probably the additional idea that the good pagan thereby acquired some merit.

It is not without significance that from the summit of the Sultan Dagh one can look back to the East where in the far distance is the Lake of the Forty Martyrs!

EGBERT C. HUDSON.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

HASTINGS. D.B., v., pp. 109 *ff.*: Ramsay, Religion of Greece and Asia Minor. Historical Geography of Asia Minor, pp. 400 *ff.* (409, 410).
Journal of Hellenic Studies, 1883, pp. 23 *ff.*; 1912, pp. 151-170; 1912, pp. 124, 142.

* *E.R.P.*, p. 330, l. 34.
† *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 110. *Cf. Pauline Studies*, p. 118.
‡ *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 427.
§ *E.R.P.*, p. 312.

Ramsay. Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, i., p. 97; ii., pp. 359, 630.
Expositor, 1911, ii., pp. 269 *ff.*
Galatians, pp. 197 *ff.*
Pauline Studies, pp. 112 *ff.*
Studies in History and Art of the Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire, pp. 305-378, esp. 319 *ff.*
Sterrett. Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor, pp. 226 *ff.* No. 366.

(Dr. A. B. Cook, F.B.A., of Cambridge, writes in a personal letter: " Dr. Victor Schultz, *Altchristliche Städte und Landschaften*, Gütersloh, 1926, ii., 357-377, has a good section on Antiocheia and, *ibid.*, pp. 364 *f.*, discusses the Tekmoreioi. But of greater importance are some recent articles in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real Encyclopadie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.* Lecky, *ibid.*, xiv., 1051, accepts Ramsay's conjecture that Manes was an old Anatolian god, later Hellenized as the moon-god Men. . . . Most valuable of all, an article on the ' Xenoi Tekmoreioi,' by W. Ruge, *ibid.* v.*a*, 158-169. This careful writer, *ibid.*, p. 168, demurs to Antersin's view that τεκμορεύσας means ' having held up the crescent-shaped token before the god,' on the ground that such a token might suit the god Men, but is hardly in place for an Asiatic Artemis such as was worshipped by the Xenoi Tekmoreioi. He argues that the τεκμωρ was not an actual *object* at all, but a ritual action of some sort, to perform which was the essential expected of all adherents.")

MISCELLANEA

THE SON AND THE SERVANT

It is usually taken for granted by homiletic expositors that the combination of ideas which St. Mark i. 11 suggests as our Lord's Messianic consciousness represents something quite novel in Messianic thought. It is emphasized that the Jews were not looking for a suffering Messiah, that there is only one allusion to the idea, and that of doubtful import, in apocalyptic literature, and that no Messianic significance was attached to the Servant passages in Isaiah xl.-lv., the Servant being understood as a personification of Israel, or of a group within the nation. This is doubtless very true so far as our Lord's contemporaries are concerned. It is also probably true of the author of Isaiah xl.-lv. There is, however, a marked difference of character between the Servant of the "Servant Songs" and the Servant of the main part of the work into which the Songs have been incorporated. The latter is more obviously, and even explicitly, a personification of Israel as the author actually knew it, in the conditions of the exile, despised, maltreated, and withal perverse, blind and deaf, yet destined by God for a glorious future. The prophet is evidently under no delusions as to the character of the people even in exile. The Servant of the Songs, on the other hand, is an ideal personage, pure and innocent, the obedient Servant of God, whose unmerited sufferings atone, not only for his own race, but for the Gentiles as well. The personification is so thorough and vivid that one cannot escape the thought that in meditating upon the miseries which the faithful and devout have suffered through and because of the unfaithfulness of the majority, the author had also in mind an individual who had likewise suffered shame and injury for and on behalf of others. Such an individual would not be far to seek. Indeed, if Mr. Aubrey Johnson's reconstruction of the ceremonial of the Feast of Tabernacles is correct* he is to be found in the Davidic King, "The Son," the Messiah.

From a study of certain of the psalms, notably Nos. xviii., xxix., xlvi.-xlviii., lxxxix., cxviii., it would appear that the ceremonial of the Feast of Tabernacles in pre-exilic times conformed approximately to the ritual pattern current in Egypt and Babylonia, and so far as we can gather in Syria and Canaan,† at the New Year festivals. The motif of these celebrations may be summarily described as "new life through death," and the central act was a ceremonial re-enactment of the divine drama which was the origin of all life, the death and resurrection of the god. In this ceremonial the god was represented by the king. In Egypt the king was the God, his incarnation.‡ In Israel he was his Son, albeit by adoption.§ The prosperity of the nation for the ensuing year was to be secured by a repetition of that series of events which issued in the

* "The Rôle of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus," by Aubrey Johnson, in *The Labyrinth*, ed. S. H. Hooke.

† *Cf. Myth and Ritual*, ed. S. H. Hooke.

‡ *Myth and Ritual*, p. 24.

§ Ps. lxxxix, 20-36. *Cf.* A. Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 78-79.

creation of the world and all that is therein. In the cultus suggested by these psalms the more materialistic, not to say magical, elements are lacking. The occasion is rather one in which Jahveh manifests his "holiness"—*i.e.*, his power and willingness to bless his people. The king, who is both the son of Jahveh, his personal representative on earth, and also the representative of the people, the "focussing point of their psychic life," is brought to the very dust of death, that he may be delivered, restored, and given victory and honour by the intervention of Jahveh. At the conclusion of the ceremony, "the king has been made to suffer humiliation," he has been "chastened sore," and thereby brought to the very gates of the Underworld. Nevertheless, through the *sedek* (righteousness) of Jahveh he has been delivered from the power of "death," and thereby proved *saddik*, or "righteous"; but *ipso facto* the people themselves as forming a psychic whole, with its focus in the king, have also been delivered from "death" and proved *saddik* or righteous.*

The correspondence of the Servant Songs with the rôle of the king as the suffering Messiah, however, is not confined to generalities. It extends to details, even to language. The opening lines of the most familiar and the greatest of the Songs, Isaiah lii. 13-liii., enunciates the purpose of the Servant's sufferings and humiliation. "Behold, my servant shall deal wisely, he shall be exalted and lifted up. Just as many were astonished at thee (his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of man) so shall he startle many nations. Kings shall shut their mouths at him." In Psalm lxxxix. 28 God declares his purpose to make his "first born" "higher than the kings of the earth," while in Psalm xlviii. 3-4 the triumph of Jahveh, in and through his Son, is described as follows:

> "For lo, the kings assembled:
> They passed over together.
> Then they saw; so were they startled,
> They were alarmed, dismayed!"†

Then in Psalm lxxxix. 37 *ff.* the humiliation of the Messiah is described.

> "But Thou hast spurned and rejected;
> Thou hast been furious with Thy Messiah;
> Thou hast discarded the covenant with Thy Servant;
> Thou hast desecrated his crown to the earth.
> . . . . .
> All the passers-by have plundered him;
> He has become an object of scorn to his neighbours."

In Isaiah l. 4-9 there seems to be an allusion to a feature in the humiliation of the Messiah which Mr. Johnson does not mention in his article. "I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them which plucked off the hair. I hid not my face from the shame and spitting." In the Babylonian ceremony which corresponded to the Hebrew Feast of Tabernacles, the king was subjected to insult by the high priest, who, having stripped him of his regalia, struck him on the cheek and pulled his ears.‡

* A. Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

† The translations of the psalms are those given in Mr. Johnson's article in *The Labyrinth*, but the verse references are those of the A.V.

‡ *Myth and Ritual*, p. 53.

The purpose of the Feast of Tabernacles was to secure long life and prosperity to the king, and thereby to the people, and the conclusion of lii. 13-liii. fits in with this very well, especially if *v.* 10 be amended on lines suggested by the LXX. "And the Lord was pleased to purify him from the plague." The Servant, having submitted freely to such indignity and maltreatment that he has been brought to the very brink of the grave, is delivered by Jahveh and brought to honour. "He shall see his seed. He shall prolong his days. By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many."

The first of the Songs, xlii. 1-4, is a good description of the ideal king, the true Messiah—whose function is to "bring forth judgment in truth," and to proclaim "Torah"—*i.e.*, the Divine Law—and in the fulfilment thereof to encourage the weaker brethren. "A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench."

The Servant of the Songs may have been a personification of Israel or of the faithful remnant, and his sufferings those which resulted from the Fall of Jerusalem and the captivity of the élite of its inhabitants; but the correspondences between the experiences of the Servant and those of "the Son," the Messiah, are such that it appears as though the poet saw the humiliation and sufferings of the faithful in the light of those which he had witnessed or knew to take place annually in the Temple at Jerusalem, and found hope in the conviction that the purpose underlying was the same and that the final outcome would be the same.

JOHN R. N. HOOKER.

CORRESPONDENCE

ANAPHORA AND EPICLESIS

SIR,

The difficulties that attach themselves to a determination to restrict the work of hallowing the gifts in the Eucharist to the repetition of the words with which our Lord administered the bread and wine that He had blessed are well illustrated by Father Hebert's review of Dr. Frere's great book *The Anaphora* in your last issue.

Of these the chief is a strange nervousness about admitting the action of the Holy Ghost. The essential idea of the Epiclesis of the Holy Spirit, says Father Hebert, is that through the act of communion πνεῦμα and a heavenly substance may descend anew to earth. But is the πνεῦμα merely present in the act of Communion? Is it not also present in the Hallowing? Otherwise we seem well on the way to receptionism. Is not the Hallowing in fact the work of the whole Godhead, as Dr. Frere contends? On Father Hebert's own principles the oblation takes place in the Heavenly Sphere, the sphere of the Spirit.

Again, Father Hebert is afraid that the use of the Invocation may lead to the notion of a physical descent of our Lord on the altar, if such words as "send down" are used. That is, of course, a possibility. But it has not happened in the East with anything like the same frequency as in the West, where the utterance of the "Words" is regarded as consecratory, as popular books of devotion—in the Anglican as well as in the Roman Communion—will shew. Anyhow, the rite of 1928,

which is Father Hebert's bugbear, does not employ this kind of language. What Father Hebert seems to have overlooked is that it is not a question of one formula against another, "Words" versus "Epiclesis." Not the least of the merits of Dr. Frere's book is that it shews so clearly that the issue is between those who believe in a sacerdotal formula and a moment of consecration and those who believe in a Divine Hallowing in answer to prayer.

But surely the most desperate straits to which Father Hebert is reduced is when he objects to the Epiclesis because it is not primitive. He will hardly maintain that the "Words" theory is primitive!

But if the discussion leads to closer study of the work of our greatest liturgist, it will have been all to the good.

Yours faithfully,

A. S. DUNCAN-JONES.

THE DEANERY,
CHICHESTER.

SIR,

Fr. Hebert seems to be unable to shake himself free from the assumption which seems to be made by nearly everyone who enters into this controversy—viz., that it is a question of substituting one formula of consecration for another. It is surely obvious that the controversy will never end as long as this assumption is made. Yet there is no divine revelation nor Catholic consent as to the formula of consecration. Clearly, then, such a thing cannot be either known or necessary. Why not, instead, recognize that the prayer of the Church, whatever it may be, is sufficient for the purpose?

In his last paragraph, Fr. Hebert states dogmatically that it is "at the words of Institution" "that the Sacrifice of Christ is 'made present.'" How can he possibly know this, seeing that it has never been revealed?

E. G. P. WYATT.

RUSTINGTON,
SUSSEX.

REVIEW

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND REUNION. By H. L. Goudge, D.D. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

One often forgets to appreciate the novelty of the desire for the Reunion of Christendom. It is chiefly sought by Anglicans who are the victims and, apart from the Orthodox Church, the precursors of disunion. The Reunion Movement of the twentieth century is the natural sequel to the previous century's attempted recovery of a partially lost Catholicism, but it would surprise the Tractarians because their Catholicism represented a midway position between the two extremes which now need uniting, and also a definite refutation of all Liberalism. Perhaps at the moment it would be best to speak of a Reunion *Outlook* rather than *Movement*. A movement must be the result of an outlook, a practice based on a theory, and as yet there has been no actual movement of real significance towards bringing together the opposites which constitute the Reunion riddle.

In this superbly sane and wise book Dr. Goudge is aware that the time is not yet ripe for a Reunion Movement, and so he agitates for a Reunion Outlook—" The Creation of the Right Spirit " as he calls one chapter. In order to acquire this outlook or spirit it is essential that certain facts should be known, and so he begins by analysing most illuminatingly the state and character of the Anglican Communion. This leads to a survey of the " English mind," which is a paradox to all who are not English, because it is always illogical but often right, seldom clever but frequently wise, always independent but at the same time law-abiding and respectful to specialists. There is much to support the allegation—or condemnation—that the English mind is that of shopkeepers, practicality, and not of theologians, theory; and this accounts for much wasted time in discussions and conferences in which we delight and from which nothing much results save some satisfaction and a charitable agreement to disagree like pukka English gentlemen of the old-school-tie type.

After examining the minor causes of disagreement among Christians—*e.g.*, the variety of meaning between Hebrew, Greek and English theological terms, the use of symbolism (one might add that the English love symbolism but seldom seek to know what is symbolized) and different accredited philosophies—Dr. Goudge rightly picks out our various conceptions of the

Church and her Ministry as the major obstacles to Reunion. Part ii. is an admirable effort to reveal the true nature and function of the Church and Ministry, and should be read with care. Always Dr. Goudge writes in close touch with Holy Scripture, of which he has an incomparable knowledge, a fact well supported by apt and unfamiliar quotations. Unlike some writers, he pays profound attention to the Old Testament, and his chapter on the Israelite *ecclesia* is a gem of compression and information. Only by such a preliminary survey is he able to review the Church in the setting of the New Testament. His clear differentiation, the differentiation of the Bible, between prophet and priest contains much which accounts for the confusion between the various so-called ministries now in operation but not in co-operation.

Part iii. is practical, and a powerful plea for the Reunion Outlook as paving the way for the future Reunion Movement. Naturally here some must disagree in spite of a warning on p. 329 to refrain from criticizing individual points. Dr. Goudge's proposals are dangerous, but are they wrong? The last two chapters speak for themselves, because they are entitled "The Changes Necessary in the Roman Church" and "The Changes Necessary in Other Communions." But can the *semper eadem* Rome change without contradicting her very self, and where are the indications of change? Dr. Goudge sees a growing change as a result of the purer devotion which the Liturgical Movement is fostering, but his second paragraph which begins on p. 303 will be violently denied by every Roman theologian. Rome can produce counter-quotations to those on p. 311 which would reveal the early idea or germ of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. Again Dr. Goudge refers to the Roman use of persecution (pp. 305 *ff.*). It is true that some centuries are dyed red with the blood of those whom Rome has murdered, but these are past centuries. The Spanish Inquisitors have their places sorely reversed in modern Spain. It is not because she has lost a controlling influence over the State (p. 309) that Rome no longer persecutes. The methods by which the British Empire was won are not in use today—the Church and the Nation are culturalized in the process of time and educated through the Spirit's guidance.

This book is a prolegomena to Reunion, invaluable for the study of the clergy, and we recommend it to ruri-decanal groups. It will remove many erroneous conceptions, and will present a new and necessary viewpoint. Its clarity, fairness, wisdom and occasional humour temper the passages with which one must disagree, and must instruct the reader. If he be an Anglican, it will make him conscious of the frailties and failures

of his own Communion. This is important, because Anglicans, personally unacquainted with Rome and Nonconformity, are prone to imagine that they are the key to the problem of Reunion. Dr. Goudge condemns the error of the "Branch theory" of the Church, and he might also have condemned the idea of the "Bridge Church" which makes too much of the Anglican Communion. The function of a bridge is for convenience sake to span a danger or limitation and to unite two extremes. Is our Communion really doing this? But "bridge" has another meaning. Four representatives (the Anglo-Catholic, Evangelical, Nonconformist and Modernist), each with thirteen cards, battle to win, and victory is dependent upon incalculable luck, some skill and the quality of partners. In neither of these senses is a "Bridge Church" helpful to Reunion. Dr. Goudge shews the more excellent way, which is the wholly relevant and completely satisfactory way to the accomplishment of Cardinal Newman's prayer that we, who were once so united and so happy in our union, may be brought at last by the Divine Will into one fold and under one Shepherd.

PATRICK COWLEY.

NOTICES

THE PHILOSOPHY OF ST. BONAVENTURE. By Etienne Gilson. Translated by Dom Illtyd Trethowan, Monk of Downside Abbey, and F. J. Sheed. Pp. xiv+552. Sheed and Ward. 18s.

No student of mediæval philosophy who becomes acquainted with the works of M. Gilson will deny that he "has a way with him." It is not merely the grace of style which gives to great learning an ease of expression that may as easily deceive the unwary, but a power of selection and formulation which, given the right kind of reader, will do as much as can be done *ab extra* to make another student. It is true that he is concerned with a side of mediæval life which most of those who call themselves mediævalists find difficult and therefore neglect, which philosophers too often treat as an interlude, and those theologians who study it find serviceable chiefly for the manufacture of a particular type of intellectual strait-waistcoat. We can amuse ourselves by imagining the kind of commentary which each of them would furnish on one of the sentences of his delightful preface: "Rightly seen, the Cistercians gathered around St. Bernard, the Victorines around Hugh and Richard, the Franciscans around St. Bonaventure represent the affective life of the mediæval West at its most intense and its most beautiful." And there is something not said there, something of which for the irreverent spectator of the critics the omission will certainly add to the fun, especially if he sees them in turn reading on the following page that "the historian is no less impotent before a great philosopher than is the philosopher himself before nature." It may be that some of them will eye a little doubtfully the brilliant study of "the man and the period" which forms the first sixth of the book, and wonder if the claim made for "Brother Bonaventure, Doctor of the Church," is not a little large, and its justification a little forced in its ingenuity. And the last chapter, entitled "The Spirit of St. Bonaventure," is an eirenicon which would furnish ground for quite a number of hotly-contested engagements.

The section of the book admirably translated by Dom Illtyd Trethowan and extending from Chapter IV., "The Ideas and Divine Knowledge," to Chapter XII., "The Illumination of the Intellect," will supply a real test of the student's capacity as well as of his perseverance. The task is not made easier for him by the ill-judged decision to place the notes at the end of the book, especially since some of them, at any rate, were intended to be a help in understanding the text. But where the capacity exists, and some previous familiarity with philosophical terminology has been acquired, the perseverance will hardly fail of its reward. And that is the real importance of what M. Gilson has done. It may easily be the case that the great Quaracchi edition of St. Bonaventure's works, upon which this is founded, may not be accessible to the reader, but after a first reading he will scarcely be satisfied until it is, and the reading may even excite in English mediævalists the reflexion that it is hardly creditable to them that Robert Grosseteste's *Hexaemeron* should still remain unedited. M. Gilson's bibliography, had it been included in the

present volume, would also have indicated some curious gaps in many English libraries which could well afford to supply them.

There is some difference of opinion between the two translators as to the representation of names, there are several small slips in the notes, and the index departs rather far from usually accepted principles; but none of these features is likely to prove an obstacle to students, and considering the size and complexity of the work the translators and publishers deserve congratulation.

CLAUDE JENKINS.

THE CRISIS OF THE REFORMATION. By Norman Sykes, D.D. The Christian Challenge Series.

THE INFLUENCE AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE REFORMATION. By J. P. Hodges. Unicorn Press. 3s. 6d. each.

It is a little merciless to review together the modest but very finished work of a master of the subject and a book written by an amateur for an occasion—namely, the fourth centenary of the setting up of the English Bible in parish churches. Two standards of learning are expressed when Professor Sykes "makes no claim to originality," and Mr. Hodges believes that, apart from a sprinkling of references, "the rest of the essay is original." The first work is a great achievement of selection and condensation carried out with a fine sense of proportion; the second is quite creditably put together to meet a particular requirement.

Whereas Mr. Hodges may confuse the unlearned reader by frequent allusion to other views and opinions of which the reader very probably knows nothing, Professor Sykes may deceive even the truly learned by the deftness of his hand. Can he really have done justice to Luther as a creative mind, or given him enough credit (as being a German working for Germans) compared with Calvin (in whom we see French intellect attacking general problems)? At least the Professor has not given us much idea how the collapse of the Lutheran forces would have followed but for the new "front line" of Calvinism, nor, indeed, how Calvin helped those with whom he could not join hands, otherwise than by increasing the credit of the reform cause. The dearest interests of Anglicans and other non-Calvinist Protestants were unrepresented by Calvin, however sensitive their leaders may have been to Calvin's judgment. The genius of Calvin was not the only explanation of the success of the new ecclesiastical order in Scotland.

On p. 158 Professor Sykes blames the Reformed leaders for "not reading the signs of the times" and making the unity of the Reform their first object in the face of the counter-Reformation. But is not the paucity of men of political vision only to be expected among Protestant leaders, with whom the overmastering of individual religion by politics was a prime object of abhorrence? Professor Sykes's book, for all its merits, is not likely to give satisfaction to a great number of those for whom one may believe that Mr. Hodges has written acceptably, just because there is in it so little of that religious individualism.

Two tiny blemishes may be noted: "vulnerable," used on p. 55 as if it meant "damaging," and the translation "private" for *privatas* in Canon 3 of Trent, on p. 147.

Mr. Hodges does not so much fail to make good use of what he has

read as to guess the nature of what lies next beyond it. Thus he takes the savage mediæval treatment of heretics as if it were evidence for the existence, before the Reformation, of that dogmatic rigidity in Romanism which is rather the fruit of the counter-Reformation. And he mistakes the corruption in religious corporations consequent on the decline in religious vocations for proof that "Mediæval asceticism remained a theory" (p. 49). But with more historical training he might have been less ready to say how the religion of the supporters of the National Council for the Centenary stands related to the men and crises of the sixteenth century, which is just what his readers will most want him to say; though as many of them as are Nonconformists will doubtless challenge his statement that they have "secretly relied upon the Church of England holding the fort." W. Telfer.

Challenge of the East. By Dorothy Hogg. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

A little while ago there was a vogue among the intelligentsia for the religions of the East; and it was sometimes asserted that Christianity could not be adapted to the Eastern mind—despite its Eastern origin. Miss Dorothy Hogg is one of those who, albeit a little late, has come in with an effective challenge on behalf of the Christian East. Her assertion that China hesitates between Christianity and Communism may be somewhat exaggerated; but there is some good descriptive writing in her little book—particularly her vivid portrayal of poverty-stricken areas in Asia. Ashley Sampson.

Revelation and Response. By Edgar P. Dickie. T. and T. Clark. 10s.

The Christian Religion claims finality in a unique sense, and this finality is based upon its doctrine of revelation. That doctrine is, however, as much concerned with human response as it is with divine initiative; and Professor Dickie makes a valuable contribution to the subject in his consideration of the problem of revelation from the philosophical, psychological and ethical standpoints. He gives special weight to the opinions of Karl Barth and the theology of Karl Heim—the latter treatment being of particular value from the English translator of his three best known books; but this must not be taken to imply that Professor Dickie makes no original contribution to a subject which needs far more serious treatment than it has recently received. For his final chapters on Christian certainty and the authority of the Gospels are quite the best in the book. Ashley Sampson.

The White Horseman and Other Sermons. By E. Gordon Selwyn. S.P.C.K. 5s.

The Dean of Winchester can generally be trusted to give strong meat for good digestions—whether from the study or the pulpit; and his latest volume of sermons is no exception to the rule. There are sermons on the Jubilee, the Coronation and the tragedy of sovereignty—none of

which have lost their savour for being a little out of date; and those which deal with the life and teaching of our Lord are seasoned with the salt of human wisdom tempered with understanding. Dr. Selwyn is happy in giving some new turn of thought to some of the most hackneyed subjects, but one could wish that there had been no gaps in those arranged for seasons.

ASHLEY SAMPSON.

THE MOFFATT NEW TESTAMENT COMMENTARY, 1 CORINTHIANS. By James Moffatt, D.D. Hodder and Stoughton. 8s. 6d.

Dr. Moffatt may fairly claim the credit of having undertaken one of the hardest tasks in his series of New Testament commentaries by reserving 1 Corinthians to himself. Of all the Pauline Epistles it covers the widest field, for it has to cover all the aberrations of belief and conduct of a Church which shewed its capacity for aberration by its willingness to form "heresies" with Christ, Apollos, Paul and Cephas as their eponymous heroes. Surely this by itself is proof that Dr. Moffatt is mistaken in emphasizing the Roman character of Corinth; it was nominally a colony, but the Church at any rate had no Roman character, and I doubt if the city had much; nor do I believe that there was any particular devotion to Venus as the head of the Julian house. It strikes me as a particularly "Levantine" city and Church and for that reason peculiarly fertile in the invention of new forms of error, most of them in the last resort "rationalizations" of the individual desire for pre-eminence. (There is an excellent exposition of i. 10-17 in this commentary.) Yet it is a fairly well-educated Church; Paul treats it in his letter to more than the usual amount of rhythmical prose of a kind which would appeal to readers of the classics and the later developments of the stylists; E. Norden in *Die Antike Kunstprosa* draws his instances of Paul's use of this kind of rhetoric mostly from this letter, and they are duly noted by Dr. Moffatt, who does not, however, deal with the puzzling problem of the source from which Paul learnt the method. Was it part of the training of Jewish missionaries and delegates to the Dispersion to teach them how to write and speak to the educated pagan?

In a commentary on a document which deals with such a variety of subjects it is very hard to know which to single out either for criticism or for commendation. I do not feel that Dr. Moffatt has really envisaged the difficulty of ch. xv., which lies in the fact that Paul's arguments are no reply either to an over-materialistic view of the resurrection body (here he misrepresents the rabbis) or to a substitution for it of the immortality of the soul; he seems to be dealing with a belief that the Christian is already living in a new age which will soon be consummated in a form which will secure the immortality of those who survive into it, but in which the dead will have no share, presumably because they forfeited it by their sins. On the other hand there is an extremely wise treatment of the eucharist, which rightly emphasizes the impossibility that Paul should have made any serious innovation as against the existing tradition of the Jewish-Christian communities, and of the glossolalies of the primitive Church. I cannot agree that Paul knew Plato's "famous allegory of the cave" (p. 201); nor again that "no Christian dreamed of attending a Jewish Passover still" (p. 138), which seems directly contrary to the state of affairs implied in Acts xxi. 15 *seqq*. But I have no wish to

criticize details, for any commentator on this Epistle is bound to put forward views which are open to dispute where there is so much obscurity as to the details of the situation. In general the volume lives up to the very high standard set by the rest of the series, so far as I have seen them; and it would be very hard to award any higher praise. It moves throughout on the plane of real learning, yet it never leaves out of sight the needs of the parish priest who is concerned to find a commentary which will enable him to interpret the New Testament to a modern congregation. It is the merit of the Moffatt series to combine these two qualities, and Dr. Moffatt himself lives up to the admirable standards which he has imposed on his collaborators so successfully. WILFRED L. KNOX.

OF CONVERSION: A SERMON TO THE CLERGY BY SAINT BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX. Translated with Notes by Watkin Williams. Burns and Oates. 2s. 6d.

Mr. Watkin Williams, whose knowledge of St. Bernard and his times is unrivalled, is able to prefix to his translation a commendation of his larger work on the saint from Cardinal Pacelli, writing on behalf of the Pope. Saint Bernard found himself faced by conflict between various "schools of thought" in the Church, as well as distressed by the lax moral standard which prevailed among the clergy. The references to the pleasures of the table, "empty stage-shows" (ch. viii.), love of riches, traffic in sacrament (ch. ix.), indicate that corruption and worldliness, and even vice and profligacy, had eaten their way into the Church, and no conversion of the world could hope for success unless preceded by reformation of the clergy. Secular interests (ch. xix.) absorbed much of the time of clerks of those days, and the Church was so lightly esteemed that St. Bernard remarks that even the outside of the cup was not clean. "On all sides men have run to sacred orders, and ministries which the angels venerate they seize without reverence."

The saint appeals, denounces, implores, in a style which betrays the utmost dramatic feeling and animation, although following the ancient classical tradition of employing the customary cadences (cursus). Probably the discourse was delivered in the cloisters of Notre Dame, and it is impossible to doubt that the "clerus admodum copiosus" was edified and recalled to earnestness by such a moving appeal. The saint quotes Scripture extensively, making large use of the Psalms and Canticles. There is no reference to the teaching of Abelard, though the crisis of the conflict with that strange figure was at hand.

The notes printed in the margin of Mr. Watkin Williams's translation are of great interest and throw much light on the text as well as on the period. M. DONOVAN.

A CRITICAL STUDY OF PRIMITIVE LITURGIES. By K. N. Daniel. Kottayam: C.M.S. Press.

It is not quite easy to give a fair account of this little book. At first sight the impression is one of inextricable confusion, but things are clearer once the guiding thread has been grasped, which is the somewhat dubious hypothesis that the original authors of the Jerusalem *Liturgy of St. James*

had anticipated the eucharistic beliefs of nineteenth-century English protestantism in all important particulars. (Concealed under its liturgical thesis the book appears to carry an attack by a member of the "Mar Thoma" schism on the parent Jacobite body of Southern India.) Mr. Daniel largely confines himself to the mediæval and modern history of the Syriac *St. James* as now used in Malabar (*i.e.*, bar Hebræus' thirteenth-century abridgement of the original fourth to sixth century rite of Jerusalem in Syriac). What he has omitted to mention is that before the later seventeenth century, or perhaps right down to 1751, the churches of Malabar did not use this rite at all, but that of *Addai and Mari* (still used by the Uniats of South India in the mutilated form imposed by the Synod of Diamper in 1599). The Jacobite connection of Malabar with Antioch only began under the metropolitan Thomas Parampil I., with the despatch of Mar Gregorios from Antioch in 1665; and was completed only in 1751. Previously all the affinities of the South Indian Churches had been with Nestorian, not Monophysite, churches. Yet the book will be of more value to students who know how to use it than all this would imply. The large amount of matter illustrative of *St. James* which the author has collected from mediæval writers like Denys C. Salibi and Moses C. Kepha is not, so far as I know, to be found so conveniently elsewhere, and should prove of some value to specialists. But it should be noted that it concerns *Syrian* and not South Indian practice. Though the author's theories concerning "Primitive Liturgies" will not win much following, the book bears proof of great pains taken in the collection and verification of evidence; but there is no index. The Syriac citations are well printed.

GREGORY DIX, O.S.B.

THE GOSPELS IN THE MAKING. By Alan Richardson. S.C.M. Press. 5s.

This is an attractively written attempt to make the unlearned Christian familiar with the latest development of Gospel criticism. In 181 pages of large print the author contrives to compress the conclusions of form-criticism, accepting them in the main, yet discriminating with intelligence. "It is obvious that on such uncertain ground we should walk warily," he writes of attempts to shew that the grave-narrative was an attempt to bring the story into line with Is. liii. 9 (p. 75).

Nevertheless he seems at times very much at the mercy of the most wayward criticism. Why should not Justin Martyr be following a perfectly reliable tradition when he says that Jesus made yokes for oxen when He worked in a carpenter's shop? "We may suppose that he was only fancifully deducing this idea from the saying of Jesus: 'My yoke is easy,'" p. 49. But any teacher of that period, wishing to say "My service is perfect freedom," was almost *bound* to say "My yoke is easy." It was the obvious metaphor to a fisherman and a tax collector as well as to a carpenter or a farmer.

The Virgin Birth of course has to go: it is a "devotional aura." Suppose that St. Paul had never heard of it, what of it? Could the Virgin have had any motive at all for publishing the fact? Yet on her death-bed she might well have told the whole story to St. Luke, in her own Aramaic-construction idiom. If the visit to Egypt was introduced to make the Hosea text have a fulfilment, why should the birth-narrative in Matthew not be a recollection of St. Joseph, imparted, perhaps, to St. James, in spite of the uncritical verse 23?

Lastly, may not the evangelist have been right after all about the purpose of parables ? (p. 146). And what does Mr. Richardson mean by " in Mark's explanation . . . the whole parable is allegorised from start to finish " ? (p. 147). Whether the sower is our Lord or any other preacher makes no odds: the point is that God's laws for souls and soils are the same, and this doctrine was delivered in such a form as to make hearers think for themselves.

Mr. Richardson puts his case lucidly and attractively; there is no doubt " something in " form-criticism, but it sometimes seems a will-o'-the-wisp that leads its followers into morasses.

R. S. T. Haslehurst.

Time, Cause and Eternity. By J. L. Stocks. Macmillan and Co., Ltd. 6s.

Just as the practical difficulty of human life has been greatly intensified in modern times by the advance of scientific knowledge, which has placed in our hands more power than we can rightly use, so our theoretical difficulty, the difficulty of giving a rational account of the universe, has been enormously increased by the materialistic philosophy which has illegitimately attached itself to science. This philosophy is largely responsible for the partial eclipse of religious faith today. In the lectures under review the late Professor Stocks, whose early death was a great loss to the world of thought, presents a brief but closely reasoned argument which aims at providing the basis for a more hopeful philosophy. The concepts of time and cause had been rendered anæmic by scientific thought; for if the present determines the future time is of no account, and if the parts determine the whole, then cause is reduced to the smallest possible dimensions. Professor Stocks, with the aid of Bergson and the philosophies of " emergence," brings reality again into time. For cause he boldly goes back to Aristotle, asserting that form is not the mere resultant pattern into which matter spontaneously falls, but itself the only originative cause. On these lines he argues that mind is the form of body. But mind is not only conscious of its activity in the temporal world; it is also conscious of itself. This guarantees its connection with an order higher than the temporal—namely, the eternal. It is from the eternal order that mind derives its two characteristic qualities, power and freedom. We arrive, therefore, at a conception of the eternal which is not merely a timeless existence of mathematical or logical concepts, or even of the " values," but one which is in direct causal relation with the temporal; and this, Professor Stocks maintains, is the only eternal worth fighting for.

G. W. Butterworth.

Collects, Epistles and Gospels for the Lesser Feasts. Arranged by W. H. Frere, D.D., sometime Bishop of Truro. S.P.C.K. 6s.

Black Letter Saints' Days. A companion to " Collects, Epistles and Gospels," etc. Arranged by W. H. Frere, D.D. S.P.C.K. 2s.

Both these volumes are based on what is by common consent one of the most satisfactory features of the attempted Revision of 1928, the Calendar; and they will be of great utility to the large number of cathedrals

and parish churches where there is a daily Eucharist. No one did more than Dr. Frere to introduce diversity and distinction into the Church's round of worship; and the works before us make, therefore, a most happy epitaph for him—perhaps the only epitaph that this most selfless of scholars would have cared for. The larger volume gives the Collects, Epistles and Gospels in full; the smaller gives the Epistles and Gospels by reference only, but prefaces each "Proper" by a short biographical note on the saint commemorated.

The compiler describes his work as an "unofficial *Sanctorale*"; but it was authorized for use in the Truro diocese in 1935, and there should be little difficulty in securing authority for its use elsewhere. This is desirable not only for the devotional merits of the work, but also because only so can its weak places be discovered and set right. A Collect, like a sonnet, has got to "read well"; and that is a matter which only use can prove. The Epistles and Gospels seem to me for the most part very happily chosen; but in many cases I suspect that the "Common" of 1928 will be found to wear better than the "Proper" Collects here suggested. Meanwhile, *experientia docebit*; and hundreds of clergy will find these twin volumes a welcome addition to their Church service-books.

E. G. Selwyn.

The Forgiveness of Sins. By E. Basil Redlich, B.D. T. and T. Clark. 10s. 6d.

This book, by the Canon Theologian of Leicester, is concerned to contend for the primacy of the forgiveness of others as the condition for obtaining the forgiveness of God. The forgiveness of others is held to be something distinct from repentance in the sense in which this is generally used by Christian theology. The bulk of the book is an analysis of the doctrines about the necessary conditions for obtaining the Divine forgiveness which have prevailed in Old Testament and in Christian thought. This analysis is taken to shew that the doctrine of the forgiveness of others as a necessary condition is virtually unknown in the Old Testament, though it is to be found in the Apocrypha in Ecclus. xxviii. 2. It is primary in the teaching of Jesus, notably in the Lord's Prayer and its corollary, and in the parable of the Unmerciful Servant. Our Lord never explicitly teaches that repentance is the condition of forgiveness. Our Lord's teaching on this point can be paralleled in many places from the Epistles, but similar parallels are uncommon in post-apostolic writings, though they occur in Cyprian and other writers. The doctrine of the primacy of forgiveness as the condition of forgiveness is held to be absent from Thomistic, Tridentine, and post-Tridentine Roman theology, but to have received a partial attention from the English Book of Common Prayer, notably in the Communion Office.

In order to maintain its contention the book is compelled to do less than justice to what the Church has always tacitly or explicitly taught of the content of amendment, as a factor in repentance, and is too ready to see a divergence between our Lord's teaching and Catholic doctrine, where, intellectually at least, none exists. The chief value of the book is in its redirection to the *psychological* importance of emphasizing the forgiveness of others as necessary to obtaining the Divine forgiveness. What is said round about p. 279 about the tendency of repentance to

be self-centred, and the importance of the duty of forgiving others in making repentance less self-centred, and more truly repentance, is of great value, and is no doubt the reason for our Lord's strenuous insistence on forgiveness of others as the condition of the Divine forgiveness.

R. C. Ratcliff.

Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels. By R. H. Lightfoot. Hodder and Stoughton. 8s. 6d.

In this fascinating book, partly based on Lohmeyer's recent works, Professor Lightfoot examines the Resurrection narratives from a new angle. Mark xvi. 1-8, he thinks, formed the end of the original Gospel. The going before into Galilee refers to an eschatological appearance of the Son of Man there, where He had preached and done His mighty works. Jerusalem is the realm of darkness and sin: the Parousia would be out of place there. So in Matthew we have the final scene on the mountain of Galilee, where Jesus assumes all power in a final eschatological act. St. Luke, on the contrary, who passes over Galilee in the Acts, makes Jerusalem the scene of the Resurrection appearances in his Gospel. To St. John the Cross is the symbol of victory. There is no reason why the Resurrection appearances should not take place in Jerusalem; but he also includes the Galilæan tradition.

The obvious criticism is: Can the foundation bear so heavy a weight as all this? And, in the light of the Epistles, can St. Mark have believed that the Parousia was already past? Why should appearances not have taken place both in Galilee and Jerusalem? Harmonies of the Gospel may seem naïve today. But supposing a company of pilgrims went up to Jerusalem for the Passover and decided to make their home there—was it not inevitable that they went back to Galilee to put their affairs in order and "get their things"?

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

Communism and Anti-Religion (1917-37). By Père J. de Bivort de la Saudée. Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd. 3s. 6d.

This is a timely book. Part I. consists of the early development of the Communist anti-religion in Russia, including the growth of the U.S.D.M. (Union of Militant Godless), and Part II. traces the same phenomenon elsewhere, particularly in France and Spain. It is nothing if not fair. It not only stresses the deplorable social backwardness of Spain particularly in Estremadura, and the glaring contrast between the huge privately owned estates, whose landlords in some cases had no social sense or realization of the responsibilities of stewardship, but the author adds: "To these social defects must be added religious. The pagan superstition which was sometimes blended with the popular Christianity, and the attitude of some members of the clergy, who might well have turned aside from politics to assist in the spiritual and material uplifting of the workers, both help to explain the revolt of the people against those who were represented to them by the revolutionary leaders as the enemies of all social progress."

Terribly as religion has suffered, alike in Spain and Russia, the fault is not all on one side. Persecuted people generally spend more time in declaiming against injustice than in asking themselves why they are persecuted, forgetting the carcass and the eagles.

The concluding chapter, "The Outlook: Dangers and Remedies," sees in "Christian renovation the only effective remedy." Cardinal Verdier in June, 1936, asserted that "the Church has denounced the evils of the social order," and added, "If this teaching had been understood, many of the ills from which we suffer would have been avoided." In October, in the same year, 60,000 Alsatian Catholics, demonstrating in defence of the threatened religious liberties and Christian civilization, "promised to co-operate more actively than ever in the material, intellectual, and moral improvement of the working classes." Good, yet of what church is it not true that it has often bolted the door after the horse has been stolen?

R. S. T. HASLEHURST.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF LIFE? By Lindsay Dewar. Rich and Cowan. 3s. 6d.

Some of the volumes in the "Needs of Today" series seem bound to overlap somewhat, as when Dr. Alington discusses "Can we Believe in God?"; Fr. Martineau, "Does God Matter for me?"; and Dr. Blunt, "Our Need for God." Canon Dewar, however, manages to maintain a distinctive note in this little volume. In its first section he discusses the arguments for design in the universe and for an all-wise Creator. Section 2 views the question "Is life worth living?" from the standpoint respectively of the hedonist, the high-brow, the dutiful man and the optimist. The author has no difficulty in arguing that no outlook upon life is worth holding which does not take God into account. And in the third section, "What am I to do with my life?", he answers, "Learn to worship!", for in the surrendering of his dues to God is the key to all successful living. An exhilarating and convincing book.

G. L. MAY.

GOD'S DEMAND AND MAN'S RESPONSE. By Alec R. Vidler, B.D.
THE CHRISTIAN HOPE OF IMMORTALITY. By A. E. Taylor, LL.D. The Christian Challenge Series. Unicorn Press. 3s. 6d. each.

The series in which these two books appear sounds a new note in apologetics. The writers are not content to be on the defensive: they are not overmuch concerned with "evidences of Christianity," but they carry the war into the enemy's camp on the assumption that the best defence of the faith is a challenge to the world which tries to do without it.

Mr. Vidler's pages give the substance of his addresses to undergraduates in St. Mary's, Oxford, in connection with the mission last January. The introduction and the first chapter admirably set forth the temper of cynical scepticism which has replaced the idealism of the early post-war days. The rest of the book, however, scarcely maintains the same level of interest, nor does it quite bear out the publisher's expectation that the writer will present "an exposition of the Christian

message." Necessarily, the missioner cannot cover all the ground, but the aim of the book is to stimulate and to provoke the asking of questions, rather than to attempt to answer all the questions raised. The suggestions and prayers at the end of each chapter are excellent. But does not Mr. Vidler offer rather a slight and misleading treatment of the Atonement by saying that " the only way in which sin is cured is when someone meets it with a refusal to become its accomplice " ? The writer refers to Father Thornton's volume on the Atonement in the same series which doubtless redresses the balance. On the whole, the book leaves the impression that it has fallen between two stools: it is not quite a set of mission addresses and not a handbook of doctrine, but it should be a stimulating challenge to discussion, and it is not unmindful of devotion.

Professor Taylor's book is a book to keep. The argument is close-knit, and demands sustained attention, and it should be re-read and pondered, for it is an invaluable presentation of the grounds for the Christian belief in immortality. Dr. Taylor has no quarter for the spiritists. " A life which is to be a worthy destiny for man must not be that of a part of our nature persisting after the rest." It is a " better " life in the sense that personality is more fully developed and expressed, not a life in which the disembodied spirit is deprived of any organ of expression. The vulgarity of imagining the spirits of just men made perfect as inhabiting a sort of glorified lakeland, and deriving their happiness from the consumption of spectral whiskies and ghostly cigars, is worse than childish, and Professor Taylor comments on the baneful effects of much popular hymnology which, he considers, should be revised with unsparing hand.

The Judgment is set forth as congruous with our implanted sense of justice—the sense which makes a man appeal to " the judgment of posterity," or to the verdict which would have been given by the great men of the past.

Professor Taylor would agree with the Archbishop of York that " the mere persuasion of survival, however confidently entertained, has of itself no moral or religious value whatever. It is the quality of the life for which man believes himself to be made that makes all the difference."

M. Donovan.

Converse with God. By Jas. Wareham. Mowbray. 3s. 6d.

The Bishop of Peterborough, in a foreword to this book, describes it as " shrewd, wise, humorous and devout," and his encomium is deserved. This is just the sort of book which will correct the idea that devotional treatises are vague and platitudinous: it is brief, practical, and eminently readable. A wide range of quotations, from Richard Baxter to Father Bede Frost, reinforces the teaching offered, but we feel we would rather listen to the author than to the authorities ! He speaks out of actual experience of ordinary, modern English people, and rightly makes the Bible the basis of meditation. The Bible centenary needed such a book as this, to direct attention to one of the most valuable uses of Holy Scripture.

What the Canon has to say on Sermons may be commended to some modern Churchfolk who affect to despise them. It is no honour to the Holy Eucharist to disparage the sermon: " making the altar more beautiful does not necessitate nor justify making firewood of the pulpit."

We would especially commend the advice given in chap. x. to use the church for meditation. There is an unfortunate reaction at the moment against the open church: many clergy find it necessary to close their churches, because no one is available to spend any time in them.

M. DONOVAN.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD. Being Materials for the Historical Study of Christian Sociology. By Cyril E. Hudson and Maurice B. Reckitt. Vol. I. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

This volume (the first of two) is a valuable contribution to a subject of ever-increasing importance to Churchpeople. It is, as the preface states, intended to serve as a companion to studies, with ample guides to thought and research covering a wide field. The aim of the compilers has been to put before the student "the interpretations and comments of the best-qualified contemporary authors." The method adopted has been that of "scissors and paste," used sometimes, it seems to the present reviewer, almost to excess. It would be a help if the pages, as well as the chapters of books to which reference is made, could in a future edition be given in every case. Perhaps one of the most useful chapters is that entitled "Papacy and Empire," from which it seems worth while to quote here a paragraph in full:

"If the Papacy could have supported its independence without heavy taxation, avoided intrusion of alien nominees to benefices and cleansed itself of abuse, not even the rise of nationalism would have been likely to destroy the idea of an ultimate spiritual authority in the European mind."

We look with especial interest to the appearance of the second volume of this useful work.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

ANGLICANISM IN TRANSITION. By Humphrey J. T. Johnson. Longmans. 6s.

This book is a clear and striking account of Ecclesia Anglicana by a not unfriendly critic. The author, a priest of Newman's Oratory, a former member of the Anglican Communion, writes without the bitterness of a convert; indeed, there is much, he says, in the Church of England that is attractive to him. Fr. Johnson seems to us to take too laudatory a view of the reign of Queen Anne, and not to estimate at its real value the work of the Tractarians and of their influence in the Church. He is at times inclined to view his own Communion through rose-coloured spectacles. It is, of course, not difficult for him to put his finger on some weak points in the Church of England. The deplorable pronouncement of the Lambeth Conference on contraceptives, the weak line taken later in the matter of divorce, and the ill-timed Doctrinal Report naturally come in for some trenchant criticism. The latter with its string of platitudes and its loose holding to the articles of the Creed deserves the judgment it gets as but a poor standard to which to rally the forces of the Church of England for an evangelical campaign in response to the Archbishop's Recall to Religion. Instructed Churchpeople know quite well that the Report has only the authority of those whose signatures are attached to it, but the popular press and a large number of laity, many

of whom are sorely puzzled, regard it as an exposition of Church Doctrine. To see ourselves as others see us is always a good thing, even if the sight is at times distressing. Fr. Johnson has given a clear and candid account of certain tendencies amongst us, and we do well to ponder his book, which reads like a challenge.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

THE DEATH OF JESUS. By A. B. Macaulay, D.D. Hodder and Stoughton. 8s. 6d.

"Among the younger ministers of the Church," Dr. Macaulay writes, "there is a widespread and deep longing for a fresh and positive interpretation of the Cross. There is no subject on which they are more eager to preach: as Athanasius says, it is 'the sum' of their faith." This longing is not, however, confined to the younger generation of clergy. A very large number of priests, and particularly those who are in touch with souls through the sacrament of Penance, are eager to preach the doctrine of the Cross, and believe that a clear and careful exposition of this vital article of the Creed is of great importance today. They are therefore grateful for all reverent and devout attempts at interpretation; it is better, perhaps, not to say reinterpretation: that word is now almost worn thread-bare and is liable to misunderstanding. Dr. Macaulay approaches the subject along the threefold avenues of the will of man in relation to the death of our Lord, the will of our Lord concerning His death, and the will of the Father in the death of His Son. If this book seems to contain a little too much of Luther and Calvin for Anglican ears, there will yet be found some beautiful thoughts and passages, but nothing in it more beautiful than the well-chosen and haunting verses of St. Bernard with which it concludes.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

THE GOSPEL, CHRISTIANITY, AND OTHER FAITHS. By Heinrich Frick, D.D., Professor of Theology, University of Marburg. Translated by James Haire, Professor of Theology, Belfast. Basil Blackwell, Oxford. 3s. 6d.

Professor Haire in his preface writes: "The first distinction which Professor Frick draws, that between the Gospel and Christianity, may seem alien to our Anglo-Saxon ways of thinking." Beginning with Luther's "differentia inter Turcas, Papistas, Judaeos ac nos, qui habemus verbum" and the equal intolerance of Zinzendorf's "The Christianizing of the unconverted heathen is the work of the devil, and they become thereby more wretched and accursed," Protestantism has relapsed to Warneck's identification of the terms "expansion of Christianity" and "the proclamation of the Gospel." So today "we see . . . that a profound change has taken place in the 200 years of the history of Protestant Missions," not to their advantage. This is the general thesis of a lecture delivered during the Basel "Mission week" in 1932.

It is good to see things through others' spectacles, at times, and there is much in the idiom of the book that will be unfamiliar to Anglican readers.

R. S. T. HASLEHURST.

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher